

Baconiana.

VOL. IX.—*New Series.*

JULY, 1901.

No. 35.

THE BILITERAL CIPHER STORY EXAMINED.

[F the reading of the Baconian Cipher which Mrs. Gallup has discovered in the works of Spenser, Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Burton, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, &c., be considered in the light of a historical novel, it will be found to be interesting, fairly well written, albeit extremely prolix and full of vain repetitions, and not much more impossible than some other historical novels that could be mentioned. We should have to believe that Elizabeth was married in early days to Leicester, and had issue Francis Bacon and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. It would therefore follow that Bacon was lawful heir to the throne; that the Earl of Essex conspired against his own mother and elder brother; that Queen Elizabeth condemned her own son to the block, and employed his elder brother, of all people in the world, to draw up the indictment against him; that the Earl never proclaimed his kinship to the Queen; and that Bacon never contested his rights against the usurper, James I. Other considerations will strike the reader.* Here is a pretty kettle of fish! Here is a new reading of English History, which has escaped the minute researches of all our careful historians, and which is unsupported by any extant documents!

But let this pass. The above facts are perhaps not more wonderful than that Bacon should have written the works usually ascribed to at least seven other writers, should have mastered the various styles recalled to our memory by the above *nominis umbræ* (as they would have to be considered), and should have been able to subordinate the stately march of the majestic style he generally adopts in the works

* It would also follow that the first Earl and Countess of Essex consented to have a child affiliated to them with due succession to the estates; that the widowed Countess agreed to marry a man (Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester) already married to the Queen; and that Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon consented to accept Francis Tudor as their own son, with due succession to the estates.

published under his own name. Not more wonderful than that Bacon should have permitted himself to be a "ghost" to seven inferior men. And to what end?

But let this also pass. We have the further stupendous difficulty of a gigantic conspiracy between eight or nine authors, the printers, the type-founders, the type-setters, of one, two, three, or more, editions, not to mention Queen Elizabeth, the reputed fathers and mothers of Lord Bacon and the Earl of Essex, Sir Amyas Paulet, W. Rowley, Bacon's secretary, and others. And we are to suppose that this conspiracy was not discovered, nor even guessed at, for nearly three hundred years after Bacon's death. We may, indeed, exclaim:—"Oh, wonderful, wonderful, and most wonderful, wonderful, and yet again wonderful! and after that, out of all hooping;" or, in Aristophanic phrase:—

"Oh vile, and altogether vile, and most vile."

But an ounce of fact is worth many pounds of theory. If the cipher exist in the works of the above authors, and can be by transliteration proved to exist, and it spells out Mrs. Gallup's tale, we are bound to accept the result, however wonderful, and however vile.

Now Bacon in the *De Augmentis* gives a perfectly clear explanation of the biliteral cipher, and adds that it might prove very useful. He illustrates it with a couple of examples, and employs for that purpose two founts of type, so that a child could follow the rules and interpret the cipher. It only requires patience and care. But when we apply these rules to the pages of the early editions of Spenser and his company, samples of which Mrs. Gallup inserts in her book, and from which she produces the written story, it seems impossible to determine (i.) whether there is not a great confusion of many types (more than two), and (ii.) whether any particular letter can be surely determined to belong to a different type from a fellow letter. Mrs. Gallup gives no hints how we are to discriminate, and, after a prolonged effort, with microscope to aid, I failed completely to separate the letters into two forms of type. I was more often wrong than right; that is, my efforts completely failed to produce Mrs. Gallup's result. I do not doubt that the early types in printing were so carelessly founded that two A's, let us say, or two b's, of one single fount, might differ microscopically. In any case the onus of proof lies on Mrs. Gallup. She has to show that she, or any other sensible person, can reproduce her text when and where an

external examiner pleases. So far is this from being the case, that the President and Council of the Baconian Society enter a formal caveat that nothing in Mrs. Gallup's interpretation can be said to have been satisfactorily proved, and a signed paper in a late number of their own *BACONIANA* gives strong reasons to mistrust the story on its own merits.

But perhaps it will be possible to spare Mrs. Gallup the task of proving that Bacon was the author of the concealed story, by internal evidence—apart from the inherent improbability that he could ever have written it.

In the story (p. 365), we read of the execution of Davison, on whom the obloquy was cast of having handed on the warrant for beheading Mary of Scotland, signed by Queen Elizabeth, but, as she averred, not to be made use of without notification of her further pleasure. But Davison, though he was condemned for this offence, was not condemned to lose his head, but to be fined, and imprisoned in the Tower. He was afterwards released from imprisonment, and, as a matter of fact, died in the year 1608, with his head soundly fixed on his shoulders. Now it is certain that Bacon must have been aware of this. So much for a fatal lapse in history.*

Let us turn to language; but, before doing so, I wish once for all emphatically to disclaim any desire or intention to attack Mrs. Gallup's *bona fides*. It would seem to be, if I am right in my conclusions, the case of a bias which has almost driven her, in all honesty, to recognise peculiarities in type which, however they arise, can be made to tell almost any tale. This would account for the story being written in good sixteenth century style, albeit not Bacon's style, and cursed with "most damnable iteration." But if a modern writer, either consciously or under the stress of a preconceived impression, is employing the current language of an earlier day, he is likely, however carefully he skims over the treacherous surface, like a skater on ice that scarcely bears him, to find his fate, and plunge disastrously into the stream beneath. And now let us examine the language of the cipher story.

1. It was the English custom to use *his* in connection with inanimate objects where we now use *its*. This custom died out about 1670. *Its* (or, earlier, *it's*) began to creep into literature about the end of the sixteenth century,

* "The life of the secretarie was forfeit to the deede, . . . but who shall say that the blow fell on the guilty head; for truth to say, Davison was onely a poor feeble instrument in their handds, . . . therefore blame doth fall on those men . . . who led him to his death."

though doubtless it was used colloquially at an earlier date. The word *its* (*it's*) does not occur at all in any works of Shakespeare published during his life-time, nor in the first folio. "It," however, occurs fifteen times in the sense of *his*.^{*} Thus: "It had it head bit off by it young."—*King Lear* I. iv. 236 (A.D. 1605). In the folio of 1625 *it's* occurs nine times, and *its* once.[†] In all other cases we find *his* where we should now use *its*. In other writers of the time, from 1598, when it has first been detected, *its* (or *it's*) can be found very sparingly—e.g., Florio *twice*, Montaigne *three times* Sylvester (*Du Bartas*), Shelton, Lyly. In the Bible of 1611 *it* (i.e. *its*) occurs once: "That which groweth of it own accord" (Lev. xxv. 5). This is altered into *its* in the Authorised Version. Otherwise *his* is *always* used, or of *it*, *thereof*, &c. Thus, in Tyndale's Bible (1526), "Thou hearest his sound" altered in the Great Bible (1539) into "Thou hearest the sound thereof." Milton never uses *its*. Some fifty years ago Henry Morley discovered an unpublished poem which he asserted to be Milton's, written in the year 1647, in his own hand-writing, and signed by him. But by the consensus of critics this poem has been adjudged unauthentic, chiefly because in the eighth line occurs the word *its*:—

"He sported ere the day
Budded forth its tender ray."

Now turn we to Bacon in his published works—not the modernised editions, with present-day spelling, where we do find *its*. I have looked through more than a hundred pages, and cannot discover a single use of *its*. I ought to add that I can find only a very sparing use of *his* [‡] where we should now employ *its* (as in many modern editions where *his* is uniformly altered to *its*).^{*} Bacon seemed to prefer *thereof*, and more frequently *the* where we might have expected the possessive pronoun.

And now for the "Bacon" of Mrs. Gallup. I can only find *his* used once when referring to an inanimate object, and in that case the object may have been personified:—"From the

^{*} *It* in this sense lasted from 1420 to 1622. Still in use in modern dialects.

[†] One of these instances occurs in *King Henry VI.*, Part II., iii. 2, 393, which we can only in part ascribe to Shakespeare.

[‡] Examples.—"Sylva Sylvarum," 1651. Editor: W. Rawley. "He found the body to keep his dominion," p. 163; "You shall see [the angel of gold] out of his place," p. 163; "Aire, not satisfied with his own former consistence," p. 169. (In this last instance note the word *satisfied*. Mrs. Gallup makes Bacon use the word *satiating*, p. 42: "The report fully *satiating* everyone.") So in Essay 58, last paragraph, eight times.

rising of the sun to his rising upon the following morning" (p. 353). Whereas from a very cursory examination I find *its* as follows:—Pages 27 (three times), 38, 41 (three times), 42, 56, 159 (twice), 210, 254. Now compare this with the appearance of *its*, in "Shakespeare" in editions published after his death—before, no instances—ten times, in the Authorised Version of the Bible once, in "Milton" not at all; in "Bacon," in his published works, not at all; in all other writers *massed together, up to (say) 1670*, very sparingly. What is the inference? That the "Bacon" of Mrs. Gallup is a very modern "Bacon"—doubtless a "Bacon" of the nineteenth century.

2. From date 1000, or earlier, to 1767, we find many instances of *his* used instead of *s* in the possessive case, and, similarly, for *he* sake of uniformity, of *her* and *their*. Thus of *her*:—"Curio haunted Lucilla her company" (Lyly, "Euphues," 1647). And in the Authorised Version of the Bible, in the "Argument" to Genesis xvii., will be found the words: "Sarai her name." For *his* we may quote the well-known instance: "Jesus Christ His sake," (this doubtless to avoid Chri-st's s-ake). But at no time was *his* used instead of *s* continuously, and it is almost always found (i.) after proper names, (ii.) for the sake of euphony, after proper names ending with *s*—*e.g.*: "Job's patience, Moses his meekness, Abraham's faith" (R. Franck, 1568); "Julia, the Emperor Augustus, his daughter" (Gloss. Spenser's "Shepherds' Calendar," 1579). Similarly *her* and *their* are generally used after proper names. But in Bacon, after a diligent collation of a very great many pages, I find the constant use of the *s* without an apostrophe for the possessive case both for singular and plural, and no single use of *his*, *her*, or *their* in this sense. When the noun ends with an *s* sound, Bacon joins the two words without a connecting *s*. Thus: "Venus minion," "St. Ambrose learning," and the curious form, "Achille's fortune," which may be a printer's error, as I can find no other use of the apostrophe. All these come from the 1640 edition of the *Advancement of Learning*, Bks. I., II. In Bacon's "Resuscitatio," 1657, I find "Christes wife," and the phrase: "after Sir W. Jones speech;" but this may be the interpolation of the editor.

And now for the "Bacon" of Mrs. Gallup. Turning casually over the leaves of her story I find "Solomon, his temple," p. 24; "England, her inheritance," p. 27; "man, his right," p. 23 and p. 42; "my dear lord, his misdeeds,"

p. 43 ; "the roial soveraigne, his eies," page 59 ; "Cornelia, her example ;" "the sturdy yeomen, their support ;" "a mother, her hopes ;" "woman, her spirit ;" and, curiously enough, where we might have expected an Elizabethan to have employed *his*, "Achilles' mind," p. 302. We see then, as the result of this enquiry, that Mrs. Gallup's Bacon uses *his*, *her*, and *their* where Bacon in his published works never used them, and with a frequency and connection quite contrary to the custom of Elizabethan writers ; but that where an Elizabethan writer might have been expected to use *his* ("Achilles' mind"), there Mrs. Gallup's "Bacon" uses an apostrophe. What is the inference ? That Mrs. Gallup's "Bacon" is unfamiliar with the customary language of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, and is certainly not our Bacon as we know him in his works.

3. Mrs. Gallup's "Bacon" is repeatedly quoting from his own published works and from the plays of Shakespeare. These are some examples at random :—

"Hold up a glass," p. 35.

"At times a divinity seemeth truly to carve rudely hew'd ends into beauty," p. 213. Elsewhere : "A Ruler doth wisely shape our ends, rough hew them how we will."

"Jealousy in soule of honour."

"Although he be gone to that undiscover'd cou'try from whose borne no traveller returnes." Elsewhere : "She is now gone to that," &c., &c.

"Not onlie jesting Pilate, but the world ask, 'What is Truth.'" Elsewhere : "Asking with Pilate," &c., p. 132.

"To paint the lily, to give the rose perfume."

What is the inference to be drawn from this hauling in, neck and crop, of well-known passages ? To my mind it is that Mrs. Gallup is led to find in her story phrases familiar to her and allied to her subject-matter.

4. There are, as it appears to me, perhaps owing to my ignorance, words used in the cipher story in quite a wrong sense, or with a wrong spelling. I will give instances :—

"Gems rare and *costive*." Murray gives no example of *costive* meaning *costly*.

"I am innocuous of any ill to Elizabeth." Neither Murray nor Webster give any example of "innocuous of," *i.e.*, "innocent of," though *innocuous* may mean *innocent*. Shakespeare does not use the word.

"Surcease" is a good enough word, but "surcease of sorrow" is used by Poe, an American author ; and the use of

the phrase by Mrs. Gallup's Bacon makes one wonder whether he had ever read "The Raven."

"Cognomen," p. 29. No instance given in Murray earlier than 1809.

"Desiderata," p. 161. No instance given of *desideratum* by Murray earlier than 1652.

"Hand and glove," p. 359. Earliest instance in Murray, 1680.

Completio', instructio', portio', editio', &c. I should have expected these words to have been spelt compleçon, &c., as in early editions of "Bacon," and according to the spelling of the time.

"Cognizante," adj. Earliest example in Murray, 1820. Murray says:—"Apparently of modern introduction; not in dictionaries of the 18th century; not in Todd's 'Johnson' of 1818, nor in 'Webster,' 1828."

5. The style of the cipher story is not Bacon's. The greater part of the prose, compared with Bacon's magnificent periods, is a maundering drivel, with a few Shakespearian words thrown in, like *collied*, *surcease*, *want-wit*, *convict*, in the sense of *conquer*, *raught*, &c.; and with constantly recurrent forms of speech like *'twas*, *'tis*, which I cannot find in Bacon (though Shakespeare has the well-known passage: "'Tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis, 'tis true"), but which, in any case, only became common in the eighteenth century.

It is useless to go further into details, though I could easily multiply examples, and will do so if challenged. I have not touched upon points already indicated in Mr. G. C. Bompas' excellent paper in the *BACONIANA* of January, 1901. I will only make one further remark.

In the cipher story Bacon repeats continually, that if it were known that he claimed to be the heir to the crown his life would not be worth a day's purchase. That is likely enough. If the story is true, it is clear that it was a necessity that it should be concealed. A brave man would have proclaimed the truth and faced the consequences. But Bacon was not brave. What would a man in such a predicament do?

He might lock the secret up in his own breast, and trust it would never be divulged by his supposed father and mother, by his secretary, Rawley, or by his supposed brother, and that brother's supposed father and mother—to leave out others who must have been privy to the secret.

He might write out a full and exact statement of the facts, with names of actors, witnesses, and with dates and circum-

stantial documentary evidence, signed by all whom he could get to testify to the truth of the story. He might bequeath the parcel of sealed documents to trustworthy executors, with injunctions that the parcel was not to be opened till fifty years (say) after his death.

None but a lunatic would take action which he might describe thus:—“I have invented a cipher so certain that a child, properly instructed, could interpret it. I now give you the key to it. I have employed this cipher in my published works. If the concealed story should be discovered in my lifetime, I shall answer for it with my head. If it should never be discovered, my painful labour will have been in vain.” Yet to such an act of lunacy we are asked to suppose that the greatest and wisest of mankind committed himself!

H. CANDLER.

A REPLY.

(By kind permission of the previous writer.)

WE can but feel grateful to any opponent who will be at the pains to formulate his objections, and to expound his own views, yet it is right that the other side should be heard, especially when the questions raised involve the credit of an absent person. Since criticisms in the present Magazine amount in my opinion to attacks upon Mrs. Wells Gallup's probity, and tend to discredit her remarkable book, I assume the responsibility of replying to them.

1. The summary of historical revelations made by the deciphered matter must be passed over with a few brief comments. The current "history" of those times* seems to be so independable as to suggest the possibility that when the youthful Francis began to write, he was only partially informed as to his own antecedents and family affairs. It seems, however, to be true that Walter Devereux (who is thought to have been poisoned) was by some means *constrained* to leave his title and estates to Robert, to the exclusion of his other children, whom (in writing) he specially commended to the Queen's tender mercies.

2. The statement that Francis was adopted by the Bacons "with due succession to the estates," may be questioned. Biographers differ on this head. Some say that he received a fifth portion of the residue—others, that he was the one "least provided for;" modern research renders it doubtful that he received *anything* under the will of Sir Nicholas.

3. Most Baconians believe that for grave and important reasons Francis concealed his identity as poet and "Magus;" that he was "the great unknown," who, hiding behind the vizors of other men, shrouding his identity in the "disguised portraits," "feigned histories," and assumed names of which we know, passed through as "ghost to inferior men," intending so to remain, until in due time he should draw the curtain, pace forth, and be known as he truly was. This doctrine, amazing though it be, is more consonant with common-sense than the notion that the "Heaven-born poet" should have allowed "inferior men" to patch the magnificent fabric of his works with their own poor stuff. Difference of *quality* in the work we may reasonably ascribe to difference of age in the author.

* It is much to be hoped that this important branch of our subject will be seriously taken in hand, and probed to the bottom.

4. Did the "concealed man" organise a world-wide "Invisible Brotherhood" to help in working out his beneficent purposes? Be sure then, that this Brotherhood would be made perpetual, and its methods and doctrines transmitted to the future ages. We have strong evidence that such is the case, although, of the vast body who work according to the rules laid down by Francis, few know enough to recognise their "Great Master," fewer still (probably *four* only) hold the keys of all his secrets.

5. Remarks on the *vain repetitions* in the cipher narrative, and on the "lunacy" of the supposed attempt to transmit a secret story by means of the Biliteral Cipher, call to mind the *Promus* note: "Many men many opinions." To the present writer it appears a most happy device of a man, cabined, cribbed, prohibited from vindicating his own conduct, or declaring his own history, that he should insert these things secretly into the books which he had written, by means of the ingenious cipher which he had invented, repeating fragments of the tale so as to scatter them broadcast, and to ensure that hereafter they should be known "everywhere."

6. The old contention about "style," and the assumption that every author has but one style, and that by this style his identity may be proved, reappears in this criticism on the "Biliteral Cipher." Since a former paper on this subject is to be reprinted in *BACONIANA*, it is only desirable to note the tendency of Shakespeareans to assume that "Bacon" wrote nothing earlier than his *Moral Essays* (published 1598, when he was 37 years of age). Baconians need hardly be reminded of the mass of evidence which has been accumulated, and which tells quite another tale. But to come to the specific charge laid against Mrs. Gallup of "imitating," rather than deciphering, Bacon's English.

The argument is based upon the use in the cipher narrative of the word "its," in phrases where, in older times, *his* or *her* would have been employed for inanimate objects or abstract ideas. The critic fortifies his contention by observations made upon the works of Bacon and Shakespeare. In more than 100 pages of Bacon not one instance of "its" has been found. In the whole of Shakespeare "its" occurs only 10 times. In "the Bacon of Mrs. Gallup," Mr. Candler finds "its" as follows: pp. 27, *thrice*; 33, 42, 159, *twice*; 210 and 254, *four* times—in all 9 times.* Hence the

* The present writer's observations differ somewhat from the above. There seems to be no *its* on p. 33, or on any page from 27 to 42. On the other hand,

inference that "Mrs. Gallup's Bacon is very modern—doubtless a Bacon of the 19th century." In plain English, Mrs. Gallup has concocted the narrative in a fairly good imitation of the Elizabethan style.

To this the answer is simple. Doubtless the critic examined, as he says, more than 100 pages of Bacon, but he examined the wrong 100 pages.

Let him try "The Wisdom of the Ancients," 70 pages 8vo. Here will he find, in the Essay of *Pan* (p. 7): "Various in *its* powers . . . *its* first creation . . . change *its* surface . . . on *its* upper part . . . *its* superior and inferior parts . . . *its* own nature . . . *its* bounds . . . *its* first chaos . . . *its* parts."

So here, in less than 7 pages, "its" recurs 9 times; nearly as often as in the 360 pages of the Biliteral narrative, or in the Folio of Shakespeare. But this is not all. "The Wisdom of the Ancients" includes a Preface, and 31 Essays. Of these only 10 contain even one specimen of the word. These are:—

Essay of Pan— <i>its</i> 9 times.			Essay of Dionysus— <i>its</i> 5 times		
"	Cœlum	" 3 "	"	Icarus	" 2 "
"	Proteus	" 4 "	"	Proserpine	" 2 "
"	Cupid	" 5 "	"	Dædalus	" 1 "
"	Orpheus	" 4 "	"	Erichthonius	" 1 "

In short, "its" is used 39 times in 10 Essays filling 26 pages 8vo. Yet it is not necessary to the "style" of our Francis (even though the matter be of kindred nature) that "its" shall be found in his pages; for in the Preface, and the remaining 21 Essays filling 43 pages, *not one instance* has been found.

Should the poor cavil be raised that the English version of this very Baconian work is called a *translation* (the translator's name being withheld) we need but recall the author's saying, that although he read Latin with ease, he could not "*exercise his judgment*" upon writings which were not in his mother-tongue. Would he then sit down to pour out his thoughts in a language which did not flow freely with his thoughts? We know that he usually intrusted Dr. Playfer, or some other, with the work of translation; and so the Translation was often published first, and the original English last, under his adopted name, or with some pseudonym.

on p. 208 is "*its* place," on p. 212 "*its* part," and on p. 254 (the solitary example from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*) the word is *twice* repeated—"its ruin . . . *its* glorie:" altogether 10 *its* in the book of deciphered matter, 360 pages.

Or again, if this view be taxed as theoretical, or as special pleading, the fact remains that "The Wisdom of the Ancients" was published in English "during Bacon's life." Hence the responsibility of 39 "its" in 23 pages is merely shifted on to the shoulders of the translator, who, by the way, must have had at least two styles—Elizabethan and 19th Century,—since he wrote with or without "its."

The question now presents itself—"Is 'its' so much more frequent in good modern writing than it was about the end of 16th century?" A question to be decided only by *exhaustive* examination. The present inquiry goes no further than to a few books immediately at hand—some old, others modern, and in their natures very unlike. Besides Spenser, Bacon, and Shakespeare, the following have been examined:—

Lyly	Quarles	Collins	Strickland
Sidney	Daniel	Gray	Goldsmith
Raleigh	G. Herbert	Fielding	Dr. Johnson
Du Bartas	Wotton	Swift	Austen
Marlowe	Dyer	Addison	Edgeworth
B. Jonson	Sir K. Digby	Thompson	Dr. Arnold
Peele	Sir R. Howard	Wells	M. Arnold
Greene	Donne	Hood	Strickland
Ford	Hooker	Keats	Sydney Smith
Webster	Jeremy Taylor	Lamb	Faraday
Marstone	Fuller	Burns	Freeman
Middleton	Baxter	Prior	Hepworth Dixon
Chapman	Wilkin	Gray	J. Spedding
Shirley	Hall	Blake	George Eliot
Fountain	T. Browne	Arbuthnot	Craik
Fletcher	Shelton	Cowper	Browning
Taylor (<i>Water Poet</i>)	"Mercury" (<i>Anon.</i>)	Barbault	Dr. Creighton
R. Burton	Pope	Coleridge	Dr. Westcott
Montaigne, Florio's	Cibber	Wordsworth	Sir E. Malet
Habington	Cowley	Southey	Rider Haggard
Marvell	Hobbs	Campbell	Gissing
Crashaw	Baker	Scott	Barr
Wither	Boyle	Shelley	Sir W. Besant
Fulke Greville	Locke	Byron	Canon Gore
Sandys	Sherlock	Macaulay	

What may we conclude from the notes made during this heterogeneous and varied, if inadequate reading?

1. The use of "its," as genitive singular neuter, does not occur in printed books before the end of the 16th century. By 1605 it was common, and "doubtless," as Mr. Candler remarks, "was used colloquially at an earlier date"—say soon after 1593, when Francis "Bacon" dated his earliest

notes of small turns of speech for the improvement of his own diction.

2 "Its" seems at first to have been a kind of abbreviation for "it self," which appears (often in the same volume) in several forms, suggesting gradual evolution—"it self," "its self," "itself," "itself."

3. Like other abbreviated forms, this word was considered rather colloquial than dignified; it was, consequently, "sparingly" used in grave and polished works, whether in prose or verse. At first it is chiefly to be found in Letters, Prefaces, and light pieces. Is not this the same as in modern writing? Excepting (in both cases) where the exigencies of verse require the use of curtailed forms, such as *'tis*, *let's*, *what's*, &c., we abbreviate only in speaking. *Ain't*, *can't*, *don't*, *shan't*, *won't*, *he's*. *What?* (for *What is that you say?*) *How do?* &c., are slipshod, not elegant English, consequently they are usually excluded from poetry and highly-finished pieces. Is it not reasonable to suppose this to have been the case with "its," seemingly introduced to polite society under the patronage of "it self," and feeling its way to popular favour by many changes of spelling?

With regard to the proportional number of uses in Elizabethan and 19th century literature, "The Arcadia," published after Sir P. Sidney's death in 1586, has been attributed to the date 1580, when Francis was 19 years of age. Much was added to this curious allegory in the course of eleven editions printed up to 1662. Collation of these eleven editions might be useful to prove the order in which many words and forms were gradually introduced, and assimilated with our language. In the earliest edition "its" does not appear; but by 1662 the word has crept in, and made itself quite at home. "*Its* contexture," "*its* author," &c.

In Ben Jonson a tolerably careful perusal has failed to produce one "its," which, considering the *colloquial* style of most of those Plays, inclines one to set them down as early productions.

The same must be said of Hudibras, Cowley, and all sacred poetry, hymns, emblems, &c. So, too, of nearly all the sermons, tracts, and treatises on religious matters. Crashaw has a line "*which has sometimes been ascribed to Dryden and others.*"

"The modest water saw *its* God and blushed."

In Spenser's Poems, written in imitation of the old style,

and on the model of Chaucer, we do not, of course, meet with "itself" or "its." But in "The Ruins of Rome," 1591, and in the Spenser Sonnets, we see "itself" five times,* assuring us that the word is now at home in our language, and that "its" is not far off. Spenser died in 1599.

We come to Florio's translation of Montaigne's "Essays," composed, I believe, during the visit of Francis to the South of France, and to Bourdeaux, the home of Anthony Bacon and his friend Michael de Montaigne. This was in 1579—1581.† Five editions were published in France before the issue of the so-called English translation in 1605; Francis being then 44, and beginning to publish in his own name. By this date (which I conceive to be at least 25 years later than the actual writing of the Essays) our little word "its" was fully incorporated in the racy, familiar language of our Francis. I find it five times in the first 105 pages. "*Its* end," "the of bodies *its* (philosophy)," "*its* contexture," "how it is placed in *its* author," "*its* own model."‡

As for "itself," we find it throughout, and with every variety of spelling—"it selfe," "itselfe," "itself." "I add," says the author, "but I never alter." So these variations, like those in "Arcadia," may be additions; results of numerous revisions to which Rawley says that his master was prone. However, the point is that in 1605 the word "its" was so common as to be supposed possible in a translation made by an Italian from French into English.

It will be seen that opinions differ as to the frequency of "its" in Montaigne. Mrs. Gallup's critic states that he has found it there *three times*. But in the Florio edition there are five "its" in the first 105 pages, and dipping into two places in Cotton's edition, I have found at Book I. xix. p. 75, *three*, and Book III. xiii. p. 388, *six* examples. In the same chapter are other instances, pp. 377, 378, 381, 390, 392, *twice*, 396, 403, 416, 417, 423 *twice*, 436 *thrice*, 446. In all 22 "its" in 84 pages.

In Dr. Browne's "Pseudodoxia, or Common Errors," 19 instances have been noted in 100 pages. In the "Religio Medici," Part I., are 25 "its" in 83 pages, an average of about 20 per cent. But Part II. has only three examples in

* Stanzas 18, 21, *twice*; 29. Sonnet 27: Herself and himself still appear as personifications.

† See of Montaigne's "Essays," BACONIANA, April, July, and October, 1896. Essay writing begins with Montaigne and then passes to Bacon.

‡ Morley's Edition.

27 pages, and in "Urn Burial," the "Letter," and "Christian Morals" not one example has been found.

Such results repeatedly obtained, tend to show that the writer, or writers, after about 1595, used or discarded "its" as they pleased, and as good taste suggested. What can we think of the critics of whom we are told that an unpublished poem in Milton's handwriting, and signed by himself, having been discovered, they adjudged this poem to be unauthentic, *because*, in the eighth line occurs the word "its?"

Andrew Marvell, of all the early poets is he, perhaps, who made freest use of the word. In the sweet verses where "The girl describes her fawn" (1 page), we find "*its* foot . . . *its* lips . . . *its* chief delight . . . *its* pure virgin limbs." In "Thoughts in a Garden" the mind is neuter—"its happiness . . . *its* resemblance." The soul likewise (no longer the *soul feminine*) "like a bird . . . claps *its* wings . . . waves *its* plumes." The industrious bee "computes *its* time," and in the "Song of the Emigrants" the Gospel, the voice, and heaven's vault are similarly neuter.

No modern writers in the list above, excepting Campbell, Shelley, and Browning emulate Montaigne, Browne (in some parts), Jeremy Taylor, Baxter, and Marvell in their use of "its." The ordinary average of instances noted is from 3 to 6 per 100 pages.

Fielding, in Book I. v. of "Tom Jones" (pp. 220), has the word 5 times (less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent). Scott, in Vol. xii., *Dramas* (pp. 372) has 7 instances (2 per cent.). A detailed examination of the "Lady of the Lake," "Marmion," and a more cursory perusal of several other plays and poems does not alter the general estimate. In Browning, "its" appears 30 times in 100 pages—a high average, such as would be expected of a writer who seems to affect the colloquial and unconventional.

Much more of this sort might be produced. I am afraid that some readers may think this too much. It would not appear at all, did it not concern the honour and reputation of a writer, unable through absence, to rebut charges laid against her in this country.

2. With regard to the second indictment, Mrs. Gallup is said to have used "his," "her, or "their," where *Bacon*, in his published works, never used them, with *apostrophes*, where an Elizabethan writer might have been expected to use "his." To the common-place and non-critical mind it appears the most natural and reasonable thing that in cipher,

which has to be tediously worked out letter by letter, apostrophes, and every possible abbreviation should be used so long as they do not obscure the sense. The critic, however, argues from the standpoint that *Bacon* wrote only that which was published under that name. Some of us find good grounds for believing that Francis St. Alban, called *Bacon*, was the sole great author of an age. We hold that those many things which he found lacking in our mother-tongue, *he supplied*; experimenting on the forms of speech, the words, and even the spelling, which he compared, tested, and fixed. Since, early in life, he began to note deficiencies, and (as he wrote) to furnish all that he found needful, and since, in certain revised editions, he *added* but did not *alter*, the style is often mixed, being much affected, as we all know, by the use of certain words, and by forms of speech insignificant, but characteristic.

Taking up the free and boyish (?) first translation of "Tacitus," we see, Book I. iv. Annals, two forms of the *gen. neuter sing.*:—"Augustus time . . . of the Empire," &c., each form four times (see page 5). On page 129 we have *three* forms, "Neroes Empire . . . Tiberius cruelty . . . Didymus his Freedman . . . the letters of Actius." Such examples are not rare in early works which have undergone subsequent revision. In late or grave works of the second period "thereof" gradually supplanted "its."

3. It would indeed be rash in the present state of knowledge to affirm positively that such and such words were *not* used in the sixteenth century. Research is daily upsetting many preconceived and carefully taught notions. It is well, at least, that we are learning how much we have to learn. But I cannot pass that "good enough word" *surcease*, without a comment. It is insinuated that because Edgar Poe used this word in conjunction with *sorrow*, therefore, Mrs. Gallup has derived it from Poe. Is it not fairly probable that Poe may have read "Montaigne" (i. xxix. p. 90, col. 2, Florio), and Marlowe's "Massacre of Paris" (i. xviii. p. 6, Bullen?)* If the words *surcease* and *sorrow* are found coupled, it will probably be in books *written* (though may be not published) as early as 1583.

Meanwhile, let us not be as the grammarians of whom the author of the "Religio Medici" says, that they "hack and slash for the genitive case in Jupiter." Rather should these

* I think that the word is in the "Arcadia" 1662, but cannot find the reference; it is both in *Bacon* and *Shakespeare*.

and such-like microscopic particulars be regarded as so many fine but strong threads of knowledge *to be spun upon* and woven into the marvellous fabric designed by the master weaver, Francis St. Alban.

CONSTANCE M. POTT.

THE POEMS ASCRIBED TO SPENSER.

[IN response to my *ballon d'essai* on this subject in the January BACONIANA, I had hoped that some fellow-Baconian would take a spade and join me in digging, to see whether there was likely foundation for the biliteral cipher assertion that Francis Bacon by consent used the name of a certain Edmund Spenser as the ostensible author of these poems. Instead, I am reminded that the onus of proof lies on those who question a traditional authorship. This is a correct and orthodox literary attitude, if not perhaps a truly Baconian spirit; and though I am predisposed to join my friends in the armchairs, and say, "Prove it, my dear sir, prove it," an obligation rests upon me to put forward for consideration further points which I think support the cipher allegation.

I.—THE TRADITION.

At, we may say, the beginnings of English literature, were born into the world in the years 1553, 1560, and 1564, so we are told, three men whose attributed writings have made an indelible mark upon the literature of our country—Spenser, Bacon, and Shakespeare. Each is renowned for the marvellous learning, philosophical judgment, poetic insight and religious feeling shown in the works attributed to him. Said Christopher North, in the course of his seven charming essays on Spenser in "Blackwood's Magazine" of 1834, "Thus sings the Philosophical, Pious Poet; his hymns and odes on Nature and Nature's God and the tongues of men are as of angels." Each displays a gentleness of spirit, a keen love of nature, a sadness of heart alternating with a fine sense of humour. Each was a lawyer, a courtier, and a voluminous writer. To again quote North, "Spenser's genius was like Shakespeare's, at least in its profusion." At a time of limited vocabularies, the works attributed to each showed a vast store of words at command. Like phrases, like words, like metaphors, like illustrations were used. Through all the

works, we notice a dominating desire to teach and instruct, yet the works of Bacon contain no allusion to the existence of the works or poems of Spenser or Shakespeare. The works of the others equally ignore Bacon and one another. Tradition says they were not the works of one author, but of three authors. Thirty years ago what may be indicated as the German school of Biblical criticism was scorned and rejected. To-day it has general acceptance, and is incorporated in modern text-books. The Shakespearean myth, attenuated and shown in all its hollowness by the exertions of the Shakespeare Society, whose researches have only proved the impossibility of the author of the plays being such a man as the Stratford records show, is now practically dissolved by the wealth of Baconian criticism of the past twenty years. Until about the present year the Spenser authorship has never been seriously questioned, nothing having arisen to suggest that the name was a mask. Tradition has therefore held the field, unassailed and undisputed. The cipher story does not assert that Spenser, any more than Shakespeare, never existed; but that, as the latter's idealised name was used, by consent, as the ostensible author of plays written by Francis, so was Spenser's name the mask or weed for certain of the same writer's poems. According to the "Dictionary of National Biography," the biographical evidences are practically confined to certain Irish State Papers, some MS. letters from Gabriel Harvey brought to light by the Camden Society, certain printed letters between Harvey and Immerito, a few other details collected by the late Dr. Grosart, together with the statements and inferences from the works themselves. We are further assured that virtually everything known about Spenser has been brought together in the nine volumes of his life and works edited by Dr. Grosart. I have carefully read and noted my set of these volumes and the three volumes of Harvey's life and letters, and having made other references, now offer some considerations to those interested.

II.—THE GABRIEL-HARVEY TESTIMONY.

Harvey matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1566; Spenser, as a poor or serving scholar at Pembroke Hall, in 1569. The dates of birth of both men are unknown. Harvey was admitted B.A. in 1570, M.A. in 1573. Spenser was B.A. in 1573, and commenced M.A. in 1576. I infer that Harvey was three years older than Spenser, possibly a year or two more. In 1579, when the Immerito correspondence

commenced, Harvey would be about 30, Spenser about 27. Francis was at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, from April, 1573, to December, 1575. He took no degree, but was remarkable for the extent of his learning. Harvey and Spenser were at Pembroke Hall from 1570, when Harvey was elected a fellow there, to 1576, though as to what association would take place in those days between a fellow of the college and a serving scholar I have no means of forming an opinion. From the E. K. letter to Harvey prefixed to the "Shepherd's Calendar" the bond between Immerito (whoever he was) and Harvey would seem to have been that they were fellow poets. Of Spenser's doings from 1576 to 1581, there is no external evidence. He is reported to have accompanied Lord Grey to Ireland as secretary, in which case he would land in Dublin, August 12th, 1580. The first record is of his appearing at the Court of Exchequer, Dublin, on May 6th, 1581. Let me now return to the correspondence. It consists of letters from Immerito to Harvey of 16th October, 1579, and 9th April, 1580, and from Harvey to Immerito 23rd October, 1579, two undated, but written between April 6th and June 19th 1580, and two (not printed) written subsequent to the publication on August 1st, 1580, of certain of Harvey's poems. The printed letters were not entered Stationers' Hall, but the three 1580 letters were published on 19th June, 1580, and the two of 1579, later in the same year. The only possible reference to Spenser's name is the word "Edmontus" which appears in some Latin verse written by Immerito in the letters *last published*. I surmise the consent of Spenser to the use of his name had not been obtained until 1580. Now, to look carefully at the letters in order of date. Immerito on 16th October, 1579, writes evidently in reply to letters urging him to go on publishing. There is no evidence of any publication in Spenser's name earlier than the "Shepherd's Calendar" (December, 1579). What then does Immerito mean by the following sentence, "First I was minded for awhile to have intermitted the uttering of my writings; lest by over-much cloying their noble ears I should gather a contempt of myself, or else seem rather for gain or commodity to do it for some sweetness that I have already tasted." To intermit implies a previous uttering, or publication. My conjecture is that Euphues's "Anatomy of Wit," published in 1579, was here referred to. This booklet appears, by Mrs. Gallup's recent decipherings to have been written by Francis, and published under the name of Lyly.

It is curious (on the traditional view) that a poor scholar should be found able to be at the cost of publication, or that having done it should be afraid of the suggestion that it was done for gain. In the same letter Immerito states, "Your desire to hear of my late being with Her Majesty must die in itself," and later on he twice refers to the Court, which shows that he was already on excellent terms there. This indicates that the "Colin Clout" references to a first visit about 1590 are poetical merely. The letter, moreover, is dated from Leicester House. If the cipher story be true, Francis was writing from his father's house. To this Harvey replies the following week, in a letter as of one writer of poetry to another. He uses to Immerito the words, "*For all your vowed and long experimented secresie.*" What does this mean? He refers to the compact between Sydney, Dyer, and Immerito, to proclaim opposition to the current practice of rhyming, and then starts upon a long discussion as to the proper composition of poetry. Later comes a curious phrase as to Immerito's expected travel, "My Lord's honour, the expectation of his friends, his own credit and preferment tell me he must have a special care and good regard of employing his travel to the best." The next printed letter is 9th April, 1580, Immerito to Harvey. It is mostly concerned with technical points in the art of poetry. It indicates the existence of the first part of the "Fairie Queen" and other writings, shows a free use of Holingshed's works, and that Immerito had written a Glosse to a work called "Dreams." This conveys to my mind, the likelihood that the writer and E. K. (the initials appended to the Glosse of the "Shepherd's Calendar"), were one and the same person. The next letter, Harvey to Immerito, mainly concerns itself with the earthquake, on 6th April, 1580. The deferential attitude of Harvey towards Immerito should here be noted:—"I imagine your *magnificenza* will hold us in suspense." Then this sentence:—"Which my Anticosmopolita though it greeve him can best testify remaining still as we say in *statu quo* and neither an inch more forward nor backward than he was fully a twelve-month since in the Court at his last attendance upon my Lorde there," which I take to mean since the time the unfinished manuscript was in the possession of Immerito for perusal. Passing to Harvey's next letter of a date between April 6th and June 19th, 1580, I suggest for consideration that the "bold satirical libel lately devised at the instance of a certain worshipful Hertfordshire gentleman

of mine old acquaintance" may be a friendly skit on Francis himself who was, as a boy, frequently resident in St. Albans, Herts. The Latin words which follow, "*In Gratiam quorundum Illustrium Anglo-francitalorum, &c.*," seem to be an allusion to Immerito's stay in France. We have no knowledge as to Spenser's whereabouts, but do know that Francis was in France in 1577. This is a part of the "libel":—

"Everyone A per se A his termes and *braveries in print*,
 Delicate in speech queynte in araye; conceited in all points
 In Courtly guyles a passing singular odde man
 For Gallantes a brave Mirrour a Primrose of Honour
 A Diamond for nonce, a fellow peerless in England
 Not the like Discourser for Tongue and head to be found
 out:
 Not the like resolute man for great and serious affrayres
 Not the like Lynx to spie out secrets and privities of States,
 Eyed like to Argus, Earde like to Midas, nosd like to Naso.

None do I name but some do I know that a peece of a
 twelvemonth
 Hath so perfited outly and inly both body and soul
 That none for sense and senses half matchable with them."

There is nothing of a libellous nature in the above verse. Harvey further on writes of his having already addressed a "certain pleasurable and moral politic natural mixed device to his most Honorable Lordshippe." Of the two letters to Immerito subsequent to 1st August 1580, the first complains of his having, without permission, printed and published certain of Harvey's verses. But he complains very gently although obviously displeased. Why (upon the traditional assumption) should Harvey be still so deferential to the "poor scholar of Pembroke Hall." I quote certain of his references to Immerito:—

"Magnifico Signor Benevolo."
 "Your Good Mastershipp."
 "Your delicate Mastershipp."

"Alas! they were hudled and, as you know, bungled up in more haste than good speed, partially at the urgent and importunate request of a honest, good-natured and *worshipful young gentleman* who I knew, being privy to all

circumstances and very affectionate towards me or anything of my doing would for the time accept of them."

"I beseech your Benivolenza what more notorious and villanous kind of injury could have been devised against me by the mortallest enemy I have in this whole world?"

"If it chance to come once out . . . now *good Lorde* how will my right worshipping and thrice-venerable masters of Cambridge scorne at the matter?"

"Take my leave of your Excellencie's feet and betake your gracious Mastershipp, &c."

"I commend myself and mine own goodly devices, . . . the stars and your most provident wisdom, so disposing, to whose invincible and fatal resolutions I humble and submit myself."

The above style of expression is repeated in the next letter:—

"What tho' Il Magnifico Segnior Immerito Benivolo hath noted this amongst his politic discourses and matters of State and Government."

"Hath your monsieurship."

"Your good masterships worship."

"I beseech your gallantship."

"You cry out of a false and treacherous world; . . . did not Abel live in a false and treacherous world?"

"For myself I recount it one sovereign point of my felicity in general and some particular, contentment of mind, that I have such an odd friend in a corner, *so honest a youth in the city, so true a gallant in the Court, so toward a lawyer, and so witty a gentleman*, that both for his rare pregnancy in conceit and will gladly for his singular forwardness in courtesy, &c."

"Foolish is all younkerly learning, without a certain manly discipline. As if indeed for *the poor boys* only, and not much more for well-born and noble youth were suited the strictness of that old system of learning and teaching."

"*Good Lord, you a gentleman, a courtier and youth*, and go about to revive so old, and stale, and bookish opinion (that the first age was the golden age) dead and buried many hundred years."

"You suppose us students happy, and think the air preferred that breatheth on these same great learned philo-

* Francis was in 1580, or earlier, a law student at Gray's Inn, having been enrolled as an ancient in 1576.

sophers and profound clerks. . . . Would to God you were one of these men but a sennight."

I end a careful examination of the Harvey correspondence in the light of the cipher story with the conclusions that Harvey was addressing a high-born youth, a courtier, a law student, to whom he was most deferential, that this youth can hardly have been a student himself in the sense of a long stay at the University; and that this young man, with all his wit and ability, was already tired and weary of things. Did not Francis at an early age "'gin to be a weary o' th' sun?" I am disposed to think that Harvey addressed Immerito as a nobleman, and that the term "good Lord" twice used is not an expletive, nor the words Lordship and "my Lorde" merely bantering expressions.

In 1579 Spenser, at the age of 26 or 27, would not be a youth in the eyes of Harvey, aged about 30; but Francis was only in his 20th year. Nor can I understand how Spenser, the poor scholar—notice above how distantly Harvey writes of "the poor boys"—could have made such progress after 1576 as to be a gallant attending at Court in 1579. Recollect he was the son of a journeyman tailor at a period when Court favour was practically confined to the well-born. Moreover, if the tailor's son, helped to the University, and then a courtier, was Immerito, and had therefore made quick progress, why was he so discontented and sighing after a golden age? Why, after being seven years a student, and passing his degrees, should he surprise Harvey with a wish to be one? Such a remark from Francis after only a short three years of Cambridge, without taking degrees, followed by the excitement of two or three years in the French and English Courts, would be much more natural. In one of the later letters from Harvey is the jocular suggestion that Immerito might shortly be sending one of Lord Leicester's, or Earl Warwick's, or Lord Riche's players to get him to write a comedy or interlude for "the theatre, or some over-painted stage whereat thou and thy lively copemates in London may laugh," &c. If this was something more than a jest, how came the poor serving scholar to obtain such a very free hand as to warrant the suggestion of his ability to order other people's servants about? Upon the cipher hypothesis there is nothing extraordinary in Francis being at Leicester House and ordering the doings of the players belonging either to his father or uncle Ambrose, or even those belonging to Lord Rich, who married the foster-sister of Robert Earl of Essex.

III.—THE IRISH STATE PAPER EVIDENCES.

From these we gather the following facts:—

1. That on 12th August, 1580, Lord Grey of Wilton arrived in Dublin, for which place he would start in July.

2. In 1581 Edmund Spenser is engaged making copies of documents, and on 6th May he is reported as appearing at Court of Exchequer, Dublin.

3. In July, 1581, a lease of the forfeited Abbey of Eniscorthy is granted to him.

4. The same year he is appointed Clerk of Degrees to the Irish Court of Chancery.

5. In 1582 is granted to him a six years' lease of a house at Dublin, forfeited from Viscount Baltinglas.

6. In 1582 (August) is granted to him a lease of New Abbey, County Kildare.

7. In 1586 (June) he is recorded as grantee of Kilcolman Castle and 3,028 acres.

8. In 1588 (June 22nd) he resigns the office of Clerk of Degrees.

9. The same month he purchases the office of Clerk to the Council of Munster. Dr. Grosart states there is a likelihood that Spenser resided in Dublin from 1580 to 1588, when the lease of his Dublin house would expire.

10. In 1588, moreover, the grant of Kilcolman is sealed.

11. In 1589 (October 12th) litigation against Spenser is instituted by his neighbour, Lord Roche.

12. 1592 (August 29th) is the date of an Irish document marked "Exd. Ed. Spenser."

13. In 1593 he is defendant in an action instituted by Lord Roche, and assigns the Clerkship of Council to N. Curteys.

14. In 1598 (September 30th) he is appointed Sheriff of Cork.

15. 1598 (December 9th) he leaves for England where in 1598 (January 16th) he dies.

IV.—PRINTING AND PUBLICATION INFERENCES.

The "Shepherd's Calendar" was entered Stationers' Hall December 3rd, 1579: the first edition bears date that year; but in 1581 a new edition appeared from a different publisher in smaller type, closer set, and having corrections in the text. On the traditional theory of authorship this is peculiar. Dr. Grosart says "that Spenser himself oversaw these successive

editions seems certain, from corrections of 1579 and 1581 forward, and from the character of the various readings."

John Dove translated the "Shepherd's Calendar" into Latin verse five years after its publication, and stated that he did not know who was the author. In 1586 another edition of the "Calendar" was published containing further corrections.

On 1st December, 1589, the first part of the *Faerie Queene* was entered Stationers' Hall. The explanatory letter affixed is addressed to Raleigh, and dated 23rd January, 1589. During 1590 the poem was published. There is *no evidence* of any journey by Spenser from Ireland, either in that or the following year, nor of any intercourse between Raleigh and Spenser. Biographers only assume this to be so, from the statements in "Colin Clout." The assumption of poetical fiction is equally open. "Complaintes," a collection of minor poems, is entered Stationers' Hall to W. Ponsonby on 29th December, 1590, and published next year. According to the prefixed epistle of "The Printer to the Gentle Reader," these poems had "been dispersed abroad, and some of them embezzled and purloined" from the poet since his "departure over the sea." Dr. Grosart suggests that the Complaint entitled "Mother Hubbard's Tale" was in part rewritten in 1591, the year of publication. "Colin Clout," though not published until 1595, was dedicated at Kilcolman Castle on 27th December, 1591, "Daphnaida" five days afterwards (1st January, 1591, old style), in London.

The "Amoretti," published in 1595 by Ponsonby, is dedicated to Sir Robert Needham, and it is gravely suggested in the dedication that the MS. crossed the sea at the same time as Sir Robert, though unknown to him.

In the Spring of 1596, says Dr. Grosart, two daughters of the Earl of Worcester were married to Mr. H. Gilford and Mr. W. Peter respectively.

On 1st September, 1596, "Four Hymns" are dedicated from Greenwich, where the Queen had a castle.

On 20th January following (20th January, 1596), the second part of the "*Faerie Queene*" is entered Stationers' Hall by Ponsonby, and published that year.

The writer in the April *BACONIANA* says Spenser was in England in 1596. There is not a scrap of evidence of this. The matter is again entirely one of doubtful inference. If the poet were someone already in England masking as Spenser, the assumption is unnecessary. The biographer

only assumes that Spenser came from Ireland, because all these things could not well happen unless the poet were on the spot!

1597 sees another edition of the "Shepherd's Calendar."

On 12th April, 1598, "The Veue of Ireland" is entered Stationers' Hall, though not then printed.

On 30th September, 1598, Spenser is appointed Sheriff of Cork. He returned to England 24th December, 1598, and died 16th January, 1598 (old style).

His energies do not appear to have ended with his death, as in 1599 he wrote a Sonnet congratulating Lewis Lewkenor on his style in translating "The Commonwealth of Venice." In 1609, while Spenser's astral body was engaged in correcting the "Faerie Queen" for a folio edition, some Mahatma wafted down upon the publishers "Two Cantos of Mutability," which they incorporated with the observation, "which both for Forme and Matter appear to be parcel of some following Booke of the Faery Queen." Unless sweetly fooling the gentle reader, the publishers had in this instance to be guided by internal evidence!

In 1611 a corrected folio of Spenser's works was published. In order to give Spenser's astral body some rest, let us assume that the corrections were the work of our friend "Shakespeare," who was a large borrower of "Spenser's" ideas and expressions.

The inferences I draw from the above summary of facts are :—

1. That it was practically impossible for a poet in Ireland to supervise the reprinting and correcting in 1581 and 1586 of the "Shepherd's Calendar;" the distance between poet and printer being too great.

2. The "Faerie Queene," with all its difficult words, could not have been passed through the press in 1590, unless the author were in England to attend to it. There is no external evidence of Spenser's presence, only an inference from the necessity of the case.

3. The same remark applies to "Complaintes." If Spenser was over sea, how could the poems be passed through the press? If in England, why this fuss of the "Printer to the Gentle Reader?" I select a third alternative, viz., of the real author trying to explain the difficulty raised by the absence of the nominal one.

4. I assert that the "Amoretti" Sonnets, which are in the preface definitely stated to have been published while

Spenser remained in Ireland, could not have been passed through the press without his active supervision on the spot. Just imagine the difficulties, delays and expense of correcting and transmitting proofs and revised proofs, author's corrections and directions by means of special messengers between Kilcolman and London—a month travelling one way.

5. The revision work done after the death of Edmund Spenser carries its own inference.

V.—THE EVIDENCE OF THE DEDICATIONS.

That of "Shepherd's Calendar," to Sir Philip Sydney, is short and dignified, as of friend to friend.

Those of the "Fairie Queen," in 1589, consisting of Sonnets to fourteen of the chief noblemen of the Court, including the Lord Treasurer, Lord Keeper, Lord Chamberlain, High Admiral, Master of Horse, and the Secretary of State as well as to the ladies of the Court, show, says Dr. Grosart, "in almost every separate Sonnet, *touches declarative of some personal intercourse*, or as the phrase ran, 'familiar intimacy.'"

How did the Irish official resident in Dublin, 1580—88, acquire this intimacy?

Mr. Bompas draws attention to the dedications of "Muioptomos" to Lady Elizabeth Carey, wife of a relative of the Queen; "Mother Hubbard's Tale" to Lady Compton, and "Tears of Muses" to Lady Strange. These ladies, daughters of Sir John Spencer, were close around the Court and likely to be on terms of social intimacy with Francis. (They were not related to the Sir John Spencer of Canonbury Tower.)

"The sisters three,
The honor of the noble family,
Of which I meanest *boast* myself to be."

Dr. Grosart has demonstrated that there was absolutely no affinity between Spenser and the family of Sir John Spencer, of Althorpe. What then is the meaning of the poet's term "boast?" For answer turn to Book V. Canto iii. of the "Fairie Queen"—

"Sir Artegal into the Tilt-yard came
With Braggadocio whom he lately met.

.
And straight that *boaster* prayed with whom he rid
To change his shield with him to be the better hid."

A poet, masking his identity, would be most likely to boast a Spencer kinship which did not exist. It would be part of his general scheme of concealment, the "vowed and long experimented secrecy," to which Harvey's letter of 1579 is witness.

Christopher North remarks on the curious absence of any reference by the poet to his relations. If the cipher story be true the comment is wrong. We have the dedication of the "Fairie Queen" to Queen Elizabeth (mother), the beautiful sonnet to her, number 74 of the "Amoretti," the curious dedication of "Virgils Gnat" to the Earl of Leicester (father), the affectionate references in the "Ruines of Time" and other poems and sonnets to Leicester, to Ambrose Dudley, Earl Warwick, and his wife (uncle and aunt), to Sydney and his sister (cousins), to Lady Rich and to the Earl of Essex (brother) and his Countess.

There are other dedications very difficult to understand as proceeding from a resident in Ireland. How, for instance, is he concerned with Lady Helena, Marquise of Northampton, to whom "Daphnaida," that beautiful poem is dedicated in 1591 and how came his intimate knowledge of her relatives? Again, take the dedication on 1st September, 1596, to Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, and Mary, Countess of Warwick, daughters of Francis Russell, 2nd Earl Bedford, "to accept this my humble service in lieu of the great graces and honorable favours which *ye daily shew* unto me." A sister of Lady Ann Bacon was the wife of one of the Russells, and letters from her to Anthony Bacon, to be found in Dixon's "Personal History," show relations of social intimacy with the Countess of Warwick and her family. The dedication is that of a personal friend, not a mere acquaintance over from Ireland on a visit.

Before passing from this branch of the subject, Mr. Bompas is (according to Dr. Grosart) wrong in stating that Lady Compton, daughter of Sir John Spencer, erected when Countess of Dorset, a monument to Spenser. The lady who did is stated to have been Ann Clifford, daughter of the above Countess of Cumberland. She married Earl Dorset in 1608, and the Earl of Montgomery in 1630.

Moreover, she made a curious calculation of his age, putting his birth as in 1510, and his death in 1596. Had she confounded the Irish official with Edmund Spencer, the Queen's messenger?

(To be continued.)

MORE SHAKESPEAREAN ROMANCE.

MRS. C. C. STOPES has written a book in which she has proved to her own satisfaction that "By the Spear-side his [Shakespeare's] family was at least respectable, and by the Spindle-side his pedigree can be traced back to Guy of Warwick and the good King Alfred." In spite of this, Mrs. Stopes declares that "the time for romancing has gone by," and that "we must beware of drawing definite conclusions, of making over-hasty generalizations." As the *Athenæum* remarks, however, "Even Mrs. Stopes' breast-plate of erudition is not impervious to the errors of romantic biography." The following are a few of Mrs. Stopes' "generalizations" in this work, which has no trace of "romance" in its composition:—

"But among all these Shakespeares we cannot certainly fix upon any one that is directly connected with our Shakespeare. It seems *almost* certain that John Shakespeare was son of Richard Shakespeare, of Smithfield."

"We may, therefore, seeing he was somehow connected with Shakespeare, imagine Hugh Saunders' mother to have been a Shakespeare."

"Probably he did not conclude the negotiations [for coat of arms] then, thinking the fees too heavy, or he might have delayed until he found his opportunity lost, or he might have asked them for his year of office alone."

"No doubt John Shakespeare was deeply impressed with the dignity of his wife's relatives."

"It has struck me as possible that John Shakespeare may have intended ancestors though the female line."

"But one, Roger Shakespeare, was yeoman of the chamber to the king. . . . His ancestors might have been also the missing ancestors of John Shakespeare. He himself may be the Roger who was buried in Hanley in 1558, supposed by some to have been the monk of Bordesley. He may also have been the father of Thomas Shakespeare, the Royal messenger." [Why may he not be descended from Thomas Shakespeare, felon, who left his goods and fled the country?]

"It has struck me that the attempt to win arms for his father was in order to continue them to his mother."

"It is probable he was the Thomas Arden."

"It is possible he was the Thomas Arden."

"Probably he had handed over his property to his son."

"Robert was probably under age."

"She was very probably a Trussell."

"It is probable that May was born about 1535. It is *likely* that she was of age when made executor in 1556, but not at all necessary."

"Probably because the Arbies estate was even then devoted to her."

"It is quite possible that the first sale . . . and it is possible that Alice died."

"Probably there was some other hitch."

"John Shakespeare must have come to Stratford-on-Avon, probably from Smithfield, sometime before 1552."

"Probably some friendly clerk, &c."

"It is quite possible it might refer to John Shakespeare the shoemaker."

"It is quite possible that the Henley street houses."

"He [W. S.] *must have been* educated at the Stratford Grammar School."

"He [W. S.] doubtless warmly shared in the difficulties of his father's life."

"He [W. S.] had probably written some."

"Tradition has reported that he [Southampton] gave Shakespeare a large sum of money, generally said to be £1,000."

"A break had come into her [Anne Hathaway's] life; doubtless she went off to visit some friends, and the young lover felt he could not live without his betrothed, and determined to clinch the matter." ["Possibly," as the *Athenæum* remarks on this statement.]

"The St. Clement's John might have been a son of the St. Martin's John. . . . So here I thought I might justly theorize, and state my opinion that he really was the John, son of Thomas of Smithfield. . . . Supposing this John was Shakespeare's first cousin—as I believe he was—what more likely, &c."

[The *Athenæum* says of this:—"The guess is really barefaced. . . . It is the purest assumption that Thomas Shakespeare, who was presented as a regrator or forestaller of barley at Smithfield in 1575, and had a son John, was an uncle of the poet. Yet this is nothing compared to the assumption that, with Shakespeare families recorded in half the counties in England, and in London itself in the fifteenth century, an individual Shakespeare, whose birth cannot be traced in any London register known to Mrs. Stopes, may be reasonably identified with the son of a dishonest corndealer

at Smithfield, on the ground that the latter cannot be traced in Warwickshire.”]

“He was possibly the same as the archer of that name.”

“Eventually he went to London, probably with introductions.”

“Henry Shakespeare probably quarrelled with Mr. Cornwall.”

“It is probable the betrothal would, therefore, be a quiet one.”

Like Sidney Lee’s “Life of Shakespeare,” Mrs. Stopes’ book is a mass of mingled “possibles” and “probables.” Despite Mrs. Stopes’ assertion to the contrary, the “time for romancing” has not yet gone by. She is one of the brightest specimens of those whom, on page 17, she describes as “the Romanticists, who accept what is pleasant, and occasionally believe manufactured tradition to suit their inclinations.”

Mrs. Stopes is particularly indignant with Halliwell-Phillipps *re* “The Shakespeare Coat of Arms,” because “he does not scruple to affirm that three heralds, the worthy ex-bailiff of Stratford, and the noblest poet the world has ever produced, were practically liars in this matter, because they made statements that do not harmonize with the limits of his knowledge and the colour of his opinions.” Poor Halliwell-Phillipps!

But the finest piece of romance in the volume is Mrs. Stopes’ commentary on the bequest by the poet to his wife of “second-best bed, with its furniture.” Says Mrs. Stopes: “Much discussion has taken place over Shakespeare’s legacy to his wife. It may very simply and very naturally have arisen from some conversation in which a reference had been made to giving her ‘the best bed.’ But that was the visitor’s couch. ‘The second-best’ would have been her own, that which she had used through the years, and he wished her to feel that that was not included in the ‘residue.’ That was to be her very own. As to any provision for her, it must have taken the form of a settlement, a jointure, or a dower. There is no trace of the first or second. But the English law then assured a widow in a third of her husband’s property for life and the use of the capital message, if another was not provided her. The absence of all special provision for Mrs. Shakespeare seems to have arisen from her husband’s knowledge of this and his trust in the honour of Mr. John Hall, and the love of his daughters for their mother. It also supports my opinion of her extreme delicacy of constitution. *She was*

not to be overweighed by mournful responsibilities." All very nice and pretty; but it happens, as Mrs. Stopes ought to know, that the elder daughter, Susanna Hall, was left New Place and practically the whole "capital messuage," and that Shakespeare had taken steps to prevent his wife from benefiting by the widow's dower. In fact her dower had been "barred," and, as Mr. Sidney Lee says, "Such procedure is pretty conclusive proof that he had the intention of excluding her from the enjoyment of his possessions after his death." Mrs. Stopes will have none of this—but we leave Mr. Lee and Mrs. Stopes to fight the matter out between them.

G. S.

A PERFORMANCE AT THE GLOBE THEATRE.

UNDER this title the German critic of Shakespeare, Karl Elze, in "Weimar" (1878) published his imaginary visit to the Globe Theatre early in King James I. reign.

The following extracts, which are a perfectly free translation from Elze's work, may be of interest to Baconian students.

Picturing the Thames with its many buildings in view, and busy traffic, the swans are noticed; now the ornament, alas, only of its higher reaches. A crowd of watermen are shouting, "Eastward Ho!" and "Westward Ho!" some landing theatre-goers at the "Steps," fearful lest they may be late for the Play at the Globe, which begins at three precisely. This is the "summer theatre" whose stage and seats open to the sky render it quite unsuitable as quarters for the King's Players in winter. Then they migrate to "Blackfriars" on the Surrey side—a "private Theatre" roofed in, and of higher pretensions and prices than the Globe, and where Shakespeare is acted by lamp and torchlight.

The Globe, a stately building, though of wood, with flags flying from its top, was built by James Burbage, father of the popular actor, whose Hamlet is drawing crowds to-day.

Richard Burbage's fine character is as highly respected as his talents on the stage are admired, and he is always cast for the leading parts in every new piece of Shakespeare's.

Richard III., Hamlet, Othello, Macbeth, King Lear, were first taken by him, so Elze states. This is curious when we also learn that there was much rivalry between William Shaxpur and Burbage.

If the Stratford player bore the noble front and handsome elegant figure which his sculptors and admirers would have us believe, why did he put Richard Burbage into his best parts? The thing is inconceivable. Why should he have allowed Burbage to charm all the ladies, as we hear he did in the part of *Richard III.*, when he at the age of thirty-one must, according to his sculptors, have been eminently fitted to subdue all hearts? Can we for a moment contemplate Sir Henry Irving, manager and actor, not as in the other case Author (!) too, permitting another to undertake the first and leading parts in Plays produced by him?

Was it that being a "false staff," ill-adapted for wielding authority, that Will Shaxpur, better fitted by nature and habits to play such heroes as "the fat man," was cast for his parts at the discretion of the true Author-Manager, who alone "had the staff in his own hands?"*

To return to Karl Elze. Above the chief entrance of the Globe is an Atlas bending under his burden, with the Latin inscription, "All the world are Players." Elze does not specify whether this is the actual line from *As You Like It*, or not. When we know how the whole round world has been, and is the theatre of Bacon's profound genius, round which, owing to him a belt has indeed been put, binding man to man, and mind to mind, when we know how it was his aim to regenerate the "great world," the "wide world," and "emulating the glorious sun," turn "the meagre cloddy earth into glittering gold," it is rather to the Atlas bending under this burden, supporting his precious weight with faithful heart, that we turn, and in it see the true picture of Francis Bacon, our "William Shakespeare," than to the feigned busts and figures, which are foisted on us by those "who know better." That mystic figure and device over the entrance to the old Globe, was no doubt, a "curiously wrought emblem," placed there by some wise man. Was it James Burbage, builder and architect, or Francis himself, the prince of architects, who put it there?

So much for the exterior of the Play House; now for the interior. In a corner of the Proscenium we read the title of the Play: "*Hamlet*, by William Shakespeare. Scene, Helsingör."

The Play attracts poets and nobles, who sit upon the stage smoking, and drinking what the attendants bring them. The King is not in the house it is needless to say, for he "hates

* N.B.—This use of the term Staff is Halliwell's. See Webster's Dict.

tobacco like sin." James, like Elizabeth, and Francis Bacon, was blessed or cursed with a nose.* The two last named, curiously enough, both are said to have abominated the smell of "neat leather;" as to tobacco, that is a point worth investigating. It has been said Shakespeare disliked tobacco, because he never mentions it in his Plays. Did Lord Saint Albans affect the subtle weed or not? But we are again digressing.

Among the select company of critics seated on the stage is seen Ben Jonson, whose works never command an audience as large as that now assembled in front. There, too, are Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, and Prince John Ernst of Weimar (who travels under the name of Herr von Hornstein), with his gentleman-in-waiting, Herr Kaspar von Teutleben.

When the black Tragedy is over—it lasts three hours and a-half,—the audience is not weary, they do not mean to leave till they have seen Will Kempe in his original jig, which this Past-master in the art of dancing has re-arranged from an old favourite, "The Kitchen Wench. This comes as a strange contrast to the black hung and carpeted scenes that have just passed before the eyes of the house. The ghost, with his majestic mien and solemn address, has thrilled everyone (it is noticeable that the name of this distinguished actor is not given by Elze).

The pathetic rendering of Ophelia by the popular player of ladies' parts, Dick Robinson, is over for to-night. Kempe has gagged to his heart's content as the Grave-digger; and now this darling of the groundlings—aye, and of the late august Queen, is free to sing and dance and recite in the queer medley, which he has apparently invented himself, and calls a "Jig." It lasts an hour, and is there anyone present who does not applaud his efforts to the echo?—not if what Elze says be true.

Elze in the person of the German, who is supposed to be present on this occasion at the Bankside Theatre, and who chooses a time when Shaxpur has retired to Stratford, and plays no more, for his visit (a funny thing when one comes to think of it) is specially interested in William Kempe, who, it seems, had been for years in Germany. He says he lived so much in his parts that he was noted for continuing to act in the "garde-robe" † when he came off: this "garde-robe,"

* See Tennyson's "Queen Mary" (Act III. sc. v.). † It would be interesting to know when the name "green-room" was first introduced, and why? It must have superseded the old "garde-robe" at one time or another.

by the way, being behind the stage, and the private entrance and thoroughfare apparently for the critics on the stage.

Kempe is said to have given representations, dramatic of course, at all the principal German Courts, in Darmstadt, Cassel, Brunswick, Dresden, and other places, and to have made a "good business of it."

It would be as well to find out who were included in his company, and whether it was only dramatic business which took him on "tour." Secret messages may have been transmitted from one country to another by its players in the same way that the Jongleurs and the Troubadors of old sang their songs with intent, thus making their views known to those who had "ears to hear."

Kempe seems to have had a curious hobby. He made a practice of dancing "Morris" along the roads and across the country. One of his exploits was dancing to Norwich *via* Romford and "Burnt Wood." Two hundred people assembled at Chelmsford to see him, and he seems to have been glad to rest two days there before starting off again. At Norwich a thousand strong gathered in the Market-place, and he was the guest of the town, and well rewarded for his pains by the Mayor. This passion for dancing "Morris" seems to have taken Kempe as far as Italy, while in Augsburg during the time the Emperor Rudolf held his Court there he was evidently the fashion. Rudolf (that favourer of occultism), it is said, asked him whether he had really danced to Norfolk, and Kempe answered "Yes." But it seems that the Emperor did not even then believe it, but held it for one of the dancers "Flausen," whatever that may be?

There is a little book which Elze mentions called "Kempe's Nine Days' Wonder," which, perhaps, may throw light on the story of this prodigious dance feat. Pope and Bryan seem to have been both distinguished dancers in that day, though not equal to Kempe.

The "free towns" of Germany seem to have appreciated him, his art being a novelty there. While we are on the subject it will be as well to bear in mind that Heinrich Ulrich, Duke of Brunswick, was Francis Bacon's friend, a patron of the drama, and a wise philosopher. He it is, among others, to whom Kempe wended his way "with his heart of cork and his heels of feather." Why should not this company on "tour" in Germany be traced? Germany is at present an unexplored tract, rife with Baconian and theatrical associations.

ALICIA A. LEITH.

FRAME AND PICTURE.

One faith against a whole world's disbelief ;
 One soul against the flesh of all mankind !

—Lowell.

[T is of the utmost importance that I should trace the term *Frame*, and the way Bacon introduces it. In his Essay upon *Envy*, he observes: "There be none of the affections which have been noted to fascinate or bewitch, but love and envy. They both have vehement wishes, they *frame* themselves readily into *imaginations* and suggestions." (*Envy*).

Here then is a connotation between the words "*frame*," and "*imaginations*," suggesting images, or *pictures of thought*, imagination invariably standing with Bacon for the poetic faculty. Another way in which the word *frame* is introduced, is as the equivalent for *invention*:—"Aristotle that did proceed in such a spirit of difference, and contradiction towards all antiquity, undertaking, not only to *frame* new words of science at pleasure, but to confound and extinguish all ancient wisdom." (Two Books *Adv. of Learning*, Book II. 139).

The following passage will be found very important for our investigations, as it throws a strong light upon the sometimes obscure way the word "*frame*" is introduced by Bacon. Bacon in treating of the second part of Metaphysic, (the inquiry of final causes), introduces the term in the sense of the human skeleton, and *as an architectural frame*:—"For to say that the hairs of the eyelids are for a quickset and fence about the sight ; or that the firmness of the skins and hides of living creatures is to defend them from the extremities of heat or cold ; or that the bones are for the columns or beams, whereupon the frames of the bodies of living creatures are built etc." A few lines further on occurs this passage:—

"And therefore the natural philosophy of Democritus and some others (who did not suppose a mind or reason in the frame of things, but attributed the form thereof able to maintain itself, to infinite Essays or proofs of nature, which they term fortune), seemeth to me, as far as I can judge by the recital and fragments which remain unto us, in particularities of physical causes, more real and better inquired than that of Aristotle and Plato." (Page 143, Book II., Two Books *Adv. of Learning*).

From these two passages it is clear the word *frame* is em-

ployed *architecturally*, as the plan, or creative reason (Logos) behind the universe—as in the passage already cited: “I had rather believe all the fables in the legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, *than that this universal frame is without a mind.*” (*Atheism.—Essays*).

Observe that the *Creative mind*, according to Bacon, is *in the frame*. Bacon applies the analogy of Architecture to knowledges in this passage:—“And for strength, it is true that knowledges reduced into exact methods have a show of strength, in that each part seemeth to support and sustain the other; but this is more satisfactory than *substantial*: like unto buildings which stand by *Architecture* and compaction, which are more subject to ruin than those which are built more strong in their several parts, though less compacted.” (*Two Books Advt. of Learning*, 207).

The following passage is extremely important, because Bacon introduces as belonging to the *Wisdom of Tradition*, what he terms:—“*The Architecture of the whole frame of a work*:”—

“There be also other diversities of methods, vulgar and received: as that of resolution, or analysis, of constitution, or systasis, *of concealment, or cryptic*, etc., which I do allow well of, though I have stood upon those which are least handled and observed. All which I have remembered to this purpose, because I would erect and constitute one general inquiry, which seems to me deficient, *touching the wisdom of tradition*.* But unto this part of Knowledge concerning methods, doth farther *belong not only the architecture of the whole frame of a work*,† but also the several beams and columns thereof; not as to their stuff, but as to their quantity and figure.” (*2nd Book Advt. of Learning* 1605, p. 167).

In his *Essay, of Building*, Bacon writes:—“Leave the goodly fabrics of houses, for beauty only, *to the enchanted palaces of the poets*, who build them with small cost.” (*Essays*, 1625).

It is very striking to find Bacon also introducing, in his third part of learning (*which he calls poetry*), the image of

* There remaineth the fourth kind of rational knowledge, which is *transitive*, concerning the expressing or transferring our knowledge to others; which I will term by the general name of TRADITION OR DELIVERY.”—2nd Book, *Two Books Advt. of Learning*, p. 163).

† Bacon writes:—“Was not the Persian Magic a reduction or correspondence of the *principles and architectures of nature* to the rules and policy of governments?”—2nd Book, *Advt. of Learning*, p. 137).

"a Palace of the Mind," which he associates with judgment and knowledge. Bacon has just been describing Poesy (narrative, representative, and allusive), and then by an abrupt transition passes out of the theatre, with these words:—"We are beholding to poets more than to the philosophers works; and for wit and eloquence, not much less than to orators' harangues. But it is not good to stay too long in the THEATRE. Let us now pass on to the judicial place or palace of the Mind, which we are to approach and view with more reverence and attention." (2nd Book, Two Books Advt. of Learning, p. 135).

This close connotation of the theatre with the palace of the mind,—the former as art, the latter as judgment, or knowledge, is well worthy deep thought. And when we arrive at Bacon's *Methods of Tradition*, i.e., different ways, or systems of delivering, or handing on cryptic knowledge to posterity,—he writes:—"But knowledge that is delivered as a thread to be spun on ought to be delivered and intimated, if it were possible, in the same method wherein it was invented; and so is it possible of knowledge induced.—A man may revisit and descend unto the foundations of his knowledge and consent; and so transplant it into another, as it grew in his own mind." (2nd Book Advt of Learning, 1605, p. 165).

The "foundations" in this case, would probably correspond very closely with what has been understood by the *frame*, i.e., the ground plan, model, or plot of the Instauration.*

In Ben Jonson's *Underwoods*, a poem is to be found, the third part of which is entitled "*The Picture of the Body*"—with a subsection entitled "*The Picture of the Mind*." The poem is ostensibly addressed to Lady Venetia Digby, by Ben Jonson; but it throws a powerful light upon the subject of painting, as applied metaphorically to the poet's art, and also proves that the word "*Frame*" is closely connoted with the *Mind*, in exactly the way, I have been seeking to establish. The poem is too long to publish in its entire length. I therefore select the seventh, and eighth verses of the first part, (third section of the poem) and the first, second, and sixth verses of the second half of the section for illustration:—

I.

THE PICTURE OF THE BODY.

Last draw the circles of this globe,
And let there be a starry robe

* ED. NOTE.--In Somerset the people speak now of a thin animal or person as "wasted to a frame."

Of Constellations 'bout her hurled;
And thou hast painted beauty's world.

But painter, see thou do not sell
A copy of this piece; nor tell
Whose 'tis: but if it favour find,
Next sitting we will draw her mind.

—Verses VII. and VIII.

I.

THE PICTURE OF THE MIND.

Painter you're come, but may be gone;
Now I have better thought thereon,
This work I can perform alone
And give you reasons more than one.

Not that your art I do refuse
*But here I may no colours use,**
Beside, your hand will never hit
To draw a thing that cannot sit.

I call you, Muse, now make it true
Henceforth may every line be you;
That all may say, that see the frame
This is no picture but the same.

—Ben Jonson's *Underwoods* (Vers. I., II. & VI.)

These lines must immediately recall Hilliard the painter's lines, placed upon the *frame* of the miniature of Francis Bacon, (taken when he was eighteen):—"Oh that I could paint his mind;" or words to that effect in Latin. (This portrait is given in Donnelly's *Great Cryptogram*, with the Latin inscription of the painter upon the frame.) It is worthy note to remember, that Ben Jonson was sometime secretary to Lord Bacon, and translated some of his works into Latin.

In discussing *Anatomy*, Bacon observes:—"And as to the

* It is most important to observe, that some marvel,—something extraordinary, is foreshadowed in the Sonnets, in direct connotation with the word *frame*. The poet wonders if a survey backwards of five hundred years, could discover a parallel, for what he has performed?

That I might see what the old world could say
To this composed wonder of your frame.

—Sonnet 59.

It is also to be noted that the language of *architecture* also is found in these Sonnets:—

No it was *builded* far from accident.—*Ib.* 124.

Compare:—

Truth needs no colour with his colour fix'd
Beauty no pencil, beauty's truth to lay.

—Sonnets 101.

diversity of parts, there is no doubt but the *facture or framing* of the inward parts is as full of difference as the outward, and in that is the cause continent of many diseases, which not being observed, they quarrel many times with the humours, which are not in fault—the fault being *in the very frame and mechanic* of the part.” (2nd Book *Medicine*, Two Books *Advt. of Learning*).

In his *Resuscitatio*, Bacon introduces the expression,—“*Architect in the frame thereof*,” (p. 127, 1661) which is extremely valuable as a hint, particularly when it is remembered, that Bacon entitles himself ARCHITECTUS SCIENTIARUM (*Architect of the Sciences*) upon the second title-page of the first English edition of the *De Augmentis* (published 1640, and translated by Gilbert Wats; this title-page will be found upon pages 60-61, after the several introductions and prefaces).

It may be thought difficult to connote Wisdom with architecture; but the Bible does so, when it declares Wisdom to have builded her house and hewn out her seven pillars, (Proverbs ix. 1), and Bacon in his Essay of *Building* says:—“To pass from the seat to the house itself, we will do as Cicero doth in the Orator’s art, who writes books ‘*de Oratore*,’ and a book he entitles ‘*Orator*,’ whereof the former delivers the precepts of the art, and the latter the perfection. We will therefore describe a *princely palace*, making a brief model thereof.” (*Building. Essays*, 1625).

Observe how Bacon evidently is thinking of his “*enchanted palace of the poets*.” Directly we examine Cicero’s *Oratorical Invention*—we find it consists of two Books,—the first dealing with *Invention*;—the second Book commences with *Painting* (I. and II.), as illustration for the orator’s art of eloquence. Cicero gives the example of the Greek painter *Zeuxis* (who wishing to paint a *Helen*, chose for his models *five of the most beautiful maidens of Crotona*), as illustration of how rhetoric should be ransacked by study of all its best features and precepts. *Zeuxis** could not find his *ideal* in any one female

* *Zeuxis* was said by Aristotle to have failed in producing mind in his paintings. Quintilian says that *Zeuxis* followed *Homer*, who loved powerful forms even in women. *Zeuxis* combined a *dramatic* effect of composition. The favourite subject of *Apelles* was *Venus*. When therefore Bacon cites *Apelles* (in the Essay of *Beauty*) he is probably giving us a hint for, or thinking of his poem of *Venus and Adonis*. Compare:—

Describe *Adonis*, and the counterfeit
Is poorly imitated after you;
On *Helen’s* cheek all art of beauty set,

form, but he found it by selecting what was most excellent for his purpose out of several models. It is to this story Bacon probably is alluding when he says of the art methods of Apelles and Dürer,—Whereof the one would make a personage by geometrical proportions;—*the other by taking the best parts out of divers faces to make one excellent.*" (*Essays. Beauty*). This is the more probable, inasmuch as Rawley, in his life of Bacon, compares him directly with Zeuxis,—as I have already pointed out in my article entitled, "*Bacon, the Painter-Poet*" (BACONIANA).

The Crotonians consenting to this demand, brought Zeuxis a number of maidens, out of which he selects five :—"Tum Crotoniatæ publico de consilio virgines unum in locum conduxerunt, et pictori, quas vellet, eligendi potestatem dederunt. Ille autem quinque delegit; quarum nomina multi pœtæ memoriæ prodiderunt, quod ejus essent judicio probatæ, qui pulchrituo inis habere verissimum judicium debuisset. Neque enim putavit, *omnia, quæ quæreret ad venustatem, uno se in corpore reperire posse, ideo quod nihil, simplici in genere, omnibus ex partibus perfectum natura expolivit*"* (*Ib.*).

From this illustration of the painter in search of a perfect ideal, who perceives his object in different examples, and in parts of many models,† Cicero proceeds to draw his parallel. The orator must select from all writers whatever is useful for his purpose, and not confine himself to one example of writer,

And you in Grecian 'tires are painted new.

—Sonnets 53.

* Something very closely akin to this selection from many models, seems hinted at in the following description of Rosalind :—

Nature presently distill'd
Helen's cheek, but not her heart;
Cleopatra's majesty;
Sad Lucretia's modesty.
Thus Rosalind of many parts
By heavenly synod was devised
Of many faces, eyes, and hearts,
To have the touches dearly prized.

(*As You Like It* III. ii.)

† In his "Images," Lucian wishing to describe a perfect woman, he will first represent her by the finest statues in the world, *selecting the beauties of each*. It is in a "Dialogue of Lycinus and Polystratus:" "Is there anything wanting?" asks Polystratus, after mention of these perfect statues. Lycinus replies: "That the *coloring* is wanting." He, therefore, brings to his description the most beautiful works of the best *painters*. Enough is not done yet, there is the mind to be added. *He then calls in the poets*. Here then we have *statuary, painter, and poet*, each by their separate art summoned to portray this perfect woman.

but select from all. "Ac si par in nobis hujus artis, atque in illo picturæ scientia fuisset, fortasse magis hoc in suo genere opus nostrum, quam in sua pictura ille nobilis eniteret. Ex majore enim copia nobis, quam illi, fuit exemplorum eligendi potestas. Ille una ex urbe, et ex eo numero virginum, quæ tum erant, eligere potuit: nobis omnium, quicumque fuerunt, ab ultimo principio hujus præceptionis usque ad hoc tempus, expositis copiis, quodcumque placeret, eligendi potesta fuit" (*Ib.* II. ii.).

It is not exactly to this book, but to the "*Dialogues of the Orator*," and to the "*Orator*" (two other works upon Rhetoric by Cicero), that Bacon refers. But they all treat of the same subject—eloquence of speech (or writing), the building up, or construction of words, and sentences; of number and verse; and equally apply to the poetic art, and to the action of the Theatre, as to the Forum. In the third book of the *Orator's* "*Dialogues*," Crassus is introduced describing the form and harmony of the phrase. The developments of his thoughts leads him to describe in eloquent terms the harmony of the universe and the beauty of the Capitol. "*Columna et templa et porticus sustinent, tamen habent non plus utilitatis quam dignitatis.*"

It is quite impossible to mistake, or miss, Bacon's hint, or meaning, when he refers us to these works of Cicero, in connection with *building or architecture*. For it is plain, Bacon can allude to no real building, or builders' art whatever, save in a metaphorical sense, as *precepts for the erection of "a poet's enchanted palace,"* which is built of words and phrases, of number, verse, and sound, of metaphors, and illustration, all of which these books of Cicero (which Bacon alludes to), embrace and contain! Indeed this hint of architecture can scarcely be better conceived if pointed for the poet's art,—for the sections of Cicero's work—(the forty-sixth, Book III. *Dialogues of the Orator*), next to the Latin passages quoted, deals with the shortness, and length of the syllables of words, that is, with the measure of feet, or number,—with Iambics, Trochees, Dactyls, Cænapæsts, and Spondees, and gives a quotation from the *Andromache of Ennius* to illustrate a point in question. It is true Cicero draws a slight distinction between the poets and the orators' arts, but of so trifling a nature, that what applies to the one nearly applies to the other, save he forbids declamation in verse.

If the student will turn to the fifty-seventh section of the same Third Book, he will find the subject of *action* introduced.

Here at once, the theatre is placed before us, for the orators' action resembles the players' art, as Bacon tells us, in his Essay upon *Boldness*. Indeed it seems probable Bacon borrowed his story about Demosthenes and action from Cicero, who gives it in this fifty-seventh section, of the Third Book, of "Dialogues."

Mr. Hare sums up the relationship of painting to poetry in these words:—"Painting by the *outward* is to express the *inward*; Poetry by the *inward* is to express the *outward*.* *But the main and immediate business of painting is with the outward, that of poetry with the inward.* That which painting represents, poetry describes; that which poetry represents, painting can only symbolize. Fuseli was always forgetting the painter, in striving to be a poet. Perhaps the same was too much the case with Hogarth. Assuredly it is so with Martin, and frequently with Turner." (*Guesses at Truth*, page 48).

It is exactly in this double relationship of external symbolism, and internal truth (or substance), that this entire art has been conceived. An *outward* (corresponding to the sensible, and material) is placed in direct opposition to an *internal* (corresponding to the spiritual, rational or true), thus:—

Mine eye and heart are at a mortal war
How to divide the conquest of thy sight;
Mine eye, my heart thy *pictures* sight would bar
Mine heart, mine eye the freedom of that right.
(Sonnets XLVI).

Painting is something false; without rationalism, without the use of judgment we are mere pictures.

Poor Ophelia
Divided from herself, and her fair judgment
Without the which we are pictures, or mere beasts.
(*Hamlet* Act IV. v).

"All matters are as dead images," writes Bacon in his Essay upon *Counsel*, a strong hint for the idol; for materialism; for the worship of that which lacks the breath of life in its

* And verily many thinkers of this age
Aye, many Christian teachers, half in heaven,
Are wrong in just my sense, who understood
Our natural world too insularly, as if
No spiritual counterpart completed it,
Consummating its meaning, rounding all
To justice and perfection, line by line,
Form by form, nothing single or alone,
The great below clenched by the great above.

Aurora Leigh—M. Brown.

nostrils, *i.e.*, the vivifying spirit ! And observe how *painting* is classed with the *image*, or statue. Words, with Bacon, are but "images of matter," "to fall in love with them is all one as to fall in love with a picture," and Pygmalion's frenzy is a good emblem, or portraiture of this vanity." It is *judgment*, *i.e.*, the use of reason, that alone can rectify this materialism—this idol worship ! (See Sonnets XVI., XX., XXI., XXIV., XLVI., LXII., LXVII., CI., for painting).

Hare, in his *Guesses at Truth*, remarks : "Much of the *beauty* in every great work of art *must be latent*. Like the Argive seer—οὐ δοκεῖν ἀριστον, ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλειν. Such a work will be profound; and few can sound depth. It will be sublime, and few can scan height. *It will have a soul in it; and few can pierce through the body.*" (Page 435, *Guesses at Truth*) ; (Compare Sonnet XXIV.)

In his Essay of *Beauty*, Bacon introduces the name of Albrecht Dürer, a painter whose work is probably *more full of meaning and symbols* than that of any other illustrator and engraver." (*Lit. Remains*, by Sir Martin Conway). Dürer was born at Nuremburg in 1471. He was the painter of the legend of St. Christopher, and on account of this picture earned the title of the "Evangelist of Art."

"Lanzi, the delightful historian of the *Storia Pittorica*, is prodigal of his *comparisons of the painters with the poets*:—Chi sente che sia Tibullo nel poetare sente chi sia Andrea (del, Sarto) nel dipingere" (He who perceives what Tibullus is in poetry may perceive what Andrea is in painting). Barry considered painting as "*poetry realised*." And Michael Angelo, from his profundity, was called the *Dante of his art*. Bellori tells us of a curious volume in manuscript, composed by Rubens, which contained descriptions borrowed from the poets, and used for purposes of painting. Indeed, it is very striking to find poets describing their art in terms of *painting*, as when Browning exclaims : "You would have me *paint* it all plain out, which can't be; but by various artifices I try to make shift, with touches and bits of outlines." (In the *Life and Work of Ruskin*). This brevity of art is typical of all profound poetry, "So in verse, the greatest poets are those who give us their *pictures*, or moral reflections with the fewest strokes of their pen." ("Poetry and painting," p. 261, *Great Thoughts*). Lord Lytton writes : "Art in itself, if not necessarily typical, is essentially a suggester, of *something subtler than that which it embodies to the sense*. That Pliny tells us of a great painter of old is true of most great

painters; *their works express something beyond the works,—more felt than understood.*" (Note at the end of *Zanoni*). For "noble art is nothing less than the expression of a great soul," writes Ruskin, and the soul *can never adequately or entirely express itself by means of sensible objects.** Bacon in the same spirit writes:—"That is the best part of beauty which a picture cannot express; no nor the first sight of the life." (*Essays. Of Beauty*). Bacon is here telling us that "the best part of beauty" is the *spirit or soul which illuminates, or animates it*,—and which is always more or less masked, or concealed by the visible and outward sign. Bacon constantly introduces a strong caveat against placing too great credence in our senses. Here is a strong hint for the *Shakespeare materialists* to ponder over:—"For, if we believe only that which is agreeable to our sense, we give consent to the matter, and not to the author." (Page 203, *Two Books Advancement of Learning*, Book II.) "With arts voluptuary, I couple practices jocular, for the deceiving of the senses is one of the pleasures of the senses." (*Ib.* 154). "And hence it is true, that it hath proceeded that divers great learned men have been heretical whilst they have sought to fly up to the secrets of the Deity by the *waxen wings of the senses*" (p. 91) "For in knowledge man's mind suffereth from sense." (*Ib.* 203). "Divine learning receiveth the same distribution; for the spirit of the man is the same, though the revelation of oracle and sense be diverse." (*Ib.* p. 126). How can the critic suffer from *sense* in a literary point of view? The reply is, when he refuses to grasp, or acknowledge *symbolism*, which is (as Bacon calls Poesy) a divine parable. Hermione is a parable—Portia is a parable.

Bacon, in writing upon his plan of partitioning the different subjects treated of in the *Two Books of the Advancement of Learning* (1605) gives us the following profound hint, or caution, as to the way in which he has arranged or placed, and discussed his sciences:—"But for the placing of this science, it is not much material; only we have endeavoured in these our partitions to observe a kind of perspective, that one part may cast light upon another." ("Mathematic," Book II., p. 143; *Two Books Adv. of Learn.*, 1605).

Now, this word "*perspective*" grows vastly interesting, because here it is employed by Bacon in evidently just the

* Robert Browning once said:—"I know that I don't make out my conceptions by my language, all poetry being a putting the infinite within the finite. Do you believe people understand *Hamlet*?" (In the *Life and Work of Ruskin*).

same mysterious way it is introduced in the Sonnets, as "*painter's art!*" That is to say, as something by which depth, distance, indistinctness are suggested, but which may be rectified by collating different passages. In Bacon's time, telescopes and microscopes were known by the name of "*perspectives*," being instruments for bringing the obscure into light, and for magnifying the vision.

In Bacon's Essay of *Seeming Wise*, he writes:—"It is a ridiculous thing, and fit for a satire to persons of judgment, to see what shifts these formalists have, *and what perspectives* to make superficialities to seem body that hath depth and bulk.* Some are so close and reserved as they will not show their wares but by a dark light and seem alway to keep back somewhat, and when they know within themselves they speak of that they do not well know, would nevertheless seem to others to know of that which they may not well speak." (*Essays* 1625).

Mine eye hath played the painter, and hath stell'd
Thy beauty's form in table of my heart;
My body is the *frame* wherein 'tis held,
And perspective it is best painter's art.
For through the painter must you see his skill,
To find where your true image pictur'd lies,
Which in my bosom's shop is hanging still
That hath his *windows* glazed with thine eyes.
Now see what good turns eyes for eyes have done
Mine eyes have drawn thy shape, and thine for me
Are windows to my breast, where through the sun
Delights to peep to gaze therein on thee;
Yet eyes this cunning want to grace their art
They draw, but what they see, know not the heart.

(Sonnets 24).

All these images, "*of painting*," "*perspective*," and "*windows to the breast*," as well as the "*bosom's shop*," are one and all purely and particularly Baconian, being expressions for *external and internal art*, in their relationship of appearance to reality, of outside to inside.

I will take the last first. "Let it be observed, that there be two principal duties and services, *besides ornament and illustration*, which philosophy and human learning do perform to faith and religion. The one, because they are an effectual inducement to the exaltation of the glory of God. For as the Psalms and other Scriptures do often invite us to consider and magnify the great and

* Bacon is always insisting upon *solidity of learning in place of superficial ornamental acquirements*:—"For first it trieth the writer, whether he be superficial or solid." (p. 166, 2nd Bk. *Adv.*).

wonderful works of God ; so if we should rest only in the contemplation of the exterior of them, as they first offer themselves to our senses, we should do a like injury unto the Majesty of God, as if we should judge, or construe of the store of some excellent jeweller,* by that only which is set out towards the street in his shop." (Book I., *Adv. of L.*, p. 110).

So may the outward shows be least themselves†

The world is still deceived by ornament.

(*Mer. of Venice*, Act III. ii.)

* * * * *

The fool multitude that choose by show

Not learning more than the fond eye doth teach

Which pries not to the interior.

(*Ib.* Act II. ix.)

Bacon writes :—"For it seemeth much in a King, if by the compendious extractions of other men's wits and labours, he can take hold of any superficial ornaments and shows of learning." (Book I., *Adv.*, p. 88).

In condemning popular errors Bacon says :—"For as things now are, if an untruth in nature be once on foot, what by reason of neglect of examination, and countenance of antiquity, and what by reason of the use of the opinion in similitudes and ornaments of speech, it is never called down." (Book II., Two Bks., *Adv.*, p. 127).

In writing of the Architecture of Fortune, Bacon observes :—"First therefore the precept which I conceive to be most summary towards the prevailing in fortune, is to obtain that window which Momus did require : who seeing in the frame of man's heart such angles and recesses, found fault that there was not a window to look into them.—That this knowledge is possible, Solomon is our surety ; who saith, '*Consilium in corde viri tanquam aqua profunda ; sed vir prudens exhauriet illud.*' (Counsel in the heart of man is like deep water, but a man of understanding will draw it out)." (Book II., Two Bks., *Adv. of L.*, p. 193)

It ought to be deeply observed, that Bacon introduces the

* See Sonnets :—Like stones of worth they thinly placed are,

Or captain jewels in the carcanet.

(*L.* II.)

† The word "*shows*" is a thoroughly Baconian term for the theatre, or for plays. Bacon writes :—"And therefore Velleius the Epicurean needed not to have asked why God should have adorned the heavens with stars, as if He had been an Ædilis, one that should have set forth some magnificent shows or plays." (*Adv. of L.*, Book II. 1605, p. 162).

"As if the multitude, or the wisest for the multitude's sake were not ready to give passage rather to that which is popular and superficial, than to that which is substantial and profound." (Book I., *Adv.* 104).

word "*paint*" as equivalent for disguise or concealment:—"And again, in all persuasions that are wrought by eloquence, and other impressions of like nature, *which do paint and disguise the true appearance of things*, the chief recommendation unto reason is from the imagination.—For as for poesy—it is rather a pleasure or play of imagination," etc. (Book II., *Adv.*, p. 155).

In praising the characters of the Emperors Augustus and Antoninus, Bacon writes:—"So as in this sequence of six princes we do see the blessed effects of learning in sovereignty, *painted forth* in the greatest table of the world. But for a tablet, or *picture of smaller volume*, (not presuming to speak of your Majesty that liveth) in my judgment the most excellent is that of Queen Elizabeth, your immediate predecessor in this part of Britain; a princess that, if Plutarch were now alive *to write lives by parallels*, would trouble him I think to find for her a parallel amongst women." (Book I., Two Bks., *Adv.*, p. 114).

How fond Bacon is of this imagery of the painter's art, and of applying it to the productions of the pen! Of Cæsar's work *De Analogia*, Bacon says "And took, as it were, *the picture of words* from the life of reason,"* (*Ib.* 116).

Here is Bacon's description of Poetry, *in which he connotes it directly with painting*, just as Horace does in his "Poetic Art," claiming that *painters and poets have equal privilege in fiction!*

"Poesy is a part of learning, in measure of words for the most part restrained, but in all other points extremely licensed, and doth truly refer to the imagination; which, being not tied to the laws of matter, may at pleasure join that which nature hath severed, and sever that which nature hath joined; and so make unlawful matches and divorces of things, *Pictoribus atque poetis*, etc." ("Poesy," Book II., *Adv. of L.*, 1605, p. 133).

*"Here, therefore, is the first distemper of learning, *when men study words and not matter*. It seems to me that Pygmalion's frenzy is a good emblem or *portraiture* of this vanity; for words are but the images of matter; and except they have life of reason or invention, to fall in love with them is all one as to fall in love with a picture." ("First Distemper of Learning," Book I., *Adv. of L.*) This is a pretty apposite hint, and observe that Bacon has just been classing Poetry into exactly these same two divisions of words (style) and matter. "The second (Distemper of Learning) which followeth is in nature, worse than the former. For as *substance of matter is better than beauty of words*, so contrariwise, vain matter is worse than vain words." (*Ib.*) Observe how the word *substance*, is introduced by Bacon, exactly in the same way it is introduced in the plays, to signify the soul, *spirit, or inner kernel of matter*.

Bacon then proceeds to divide poetry *into words or matter*—the latter he calls “feigned history,” and apporions “as a principal part of learning,” evidently being influenced in this statement by Aristotle, who declared, “Poetry to be a more philosophical thing than history, being bound by no particulars.” “The use of this feigned history hath been to give some *shadow of satisfaction* to the mind of man in those points wherein the nature of things doth deny it, *the world being in proportion inferior to the soul*; by reason whereof there is agreeable to the spirit of man, a more exact goodness, and a more absolute variety, than can be found in the nature of things.” (*Ib.*)

(Notice the expression “*shadow of satisfaction*.” Compare “*Shadowy representations*,” said by Bacon of parabolic poetry).

Bacon means, that poetry permits of the *painting of ideals*—of perfections of virtue, and character, which cannot be realised or found in the world: “And therefore it (poetry) was ever thought to have some participation of divineness, because it doth raise and erect the mind, by submitting *the shows of things* to the desires of the mind; whereas reason doth buckle and bow the mind unto the nature of things.” (*Ib.*) Undoubtedly by the expression “*show of things*,” Bacon is alluding to allusive, or representative plays. Bacon writes:—

“Plato saith eloquently:—“That vertue, if she could be seen, would move great love and affection. *But rhetoric paints out vertue and goodness to the life, and makes them in a sort conspicuous.*” (p. 280, *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

Cicero says:—“There is a beauty ‘*quam videmus oculis animi*,’ which we see with the eyes of our mind, which beauty if we could discern with these corporal eyes, *admirabiles sui amores excitaret*; i.e., would cause admirable affections, and ravish our souls.” Hamlet’s father must have possessed some such rare spiritual beauty, causing Hamlet to exclaim: “I see him *in my mind’s eye*, Horatio.”

When we consider the vertue of Hermione; of Desdemona; or of Hero; not only has vertue been made “*conspicuous*,” but all the world confesses to the “*love and affection*” which these beautiful portraits of vertue and constancy excite in our breasts! The same might be said of Queen Katharine, in *King Henry VIII.*, and of many other characters too numerous to mention. Plutarch makes

the statement:—"That Simonides said that *poetry is a speaking picture*, and that painting is *mute poetry*."

Bacon writes:—"So painting *revives the memory of a thing* by the image of a picture. Is not this traduced into an art, which they call the art of memory?" (p. 231 *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

Once more Bacon introduces this simile of *painting in direct connotation with poetry*:—"But the *poets* and writers of histories are the best doctors of this knowledge; where we may find *painted forth with great life, how affections* are kindled and incited, and how pacified and refrained." ("Ethics," Book II., p. 183, *Advancement of Learning*, 1605).

What Bacon means by poets and painters may be illustrated by the case of Suidas (Φιλίστιων) who called his plays (Mimes) "*Biologic*" (i.e., pictures of life). Horace makes the observation:—"Ut pictura, *poesis erit, quæ si proprius stes, te capiat magis*."

How deeply Bacon had studied Aristotle's works, may be gathered from this passage upon the affections:—"And here again I find strange, as before, that Aristotle should have written *divers volumes of Ethics*, and never handled the affections, which is the principal subject thereof, and yet in his *Rhetorics*, where they are considered but collaterally, and in a second degree, as they may be moved by speech, he findeth place for them, and handleth them well for the quantity; but where their true place is, he pretermitteth them" (*Ib.*)

Hare, in his *Guesses at Truth*, remarks:—"Were nothing else to be learnt from the *rhetoric and ethics of Aristotle*, they should be studied by every well-educated Englishman, as the best commentaries upon *Shakespeare*." (*Guesses at Truth*, p. 189). This is very important, for Bacon confesses to great admiration for Aristotle's labours in rhetoric:—"And as for the labouring and culture of this art, the *emulation of Aristotle with the rhetoricians of his time*, and the earnest and vehement diligence of Cicero, labouring with all might to raise and enoble that art, joined with long experience *hath made them in their books written of this art to exceed themselves*." ("Of Illustration of Speech—Rhetoric, or Art of Eloquence," p. 279, *Advancement of Learning*, 1640).

Bacon, in writing of the *Colours of Good and Evil*, to the Lord Mountjoye, says:—"I send you the last part of the best book of Aristotle of Stagira, who (as your lordship knoweth) goeth for the best author. But (saving the curt respect

which is due to a received estimation) the man being a Grecian and of a hasty wit, having hardly a discerning patience, much less a teaching patience, both so delivered the matter, as I am glad to do the part of a good house hen, which without any strangeness will sit upon pheasants eggs. And yet perchance some that shall compare my lines with Aristotle's lines, will muse by what art, or rather by what revelation, I could draw their conceits out of that place. *But I, that should know best, do freely acknowledge that I have my light from him, for where he gave me not matter to perfect, at the least he gave me occasion to invent.*" (The Original Transcript in Harleian MS., 6797, Art. 6).*

Cicero recommends composition by means of writing, and still more the reading and study of the poets and historians.

In the first dialogue of the Orator, (addressed to his brother Quintus), Cicero claims for the Orator a union of all knowledges. Eloquence demands the great possible efforts of the human mind. It must be acquainted with philosophy, it must know the human heart. Like Bacon, it must take "*all knowledge for its province.*" Indeed when we read these works of Cicero, upon oratorical invention, upon style, action, composition, etc., adorned as they lavishly are, *with excerpts from the best examples of the Greek and Latin poets*, we seem to imagine we perceive one of the sources of inspiration which powerfully acted upon the genius of Francis Bacon, who was following the same career, pursuing the identical footsteps of the profession of the law, and who was endowed with the same literary tastes as Cicero! Cicero inculcates the doctrine of the study of the poets:—"Sed omnis loquendi elegantia, quanquam expolitur scientia litterarium, *tamen augetur legendis oratoribus et poetis*" (Book III., x., *Dialogues of the Orator*).

Bacon chose *Seneca* and *Cicero*, for the two examples to which he compared himself in point of fortune. Seneca, the writer of ten of the greatest Roman plays that have come down to us,—Cicero, the Orator, the barrister are well-known to us, but Cicero, the poet, in all but the outward name is less well-known! Nevertheless Cicero was not only in all his tastes passionately attached to the poets of Greece, and Rome,

* Archbishop Whately has pointed out, how Bacon's collection of *Antitheta*, is but an epitome of his Essays ("*Miscellanies.*" Whately). This is important, because the *Colours of Good and Evil* are but preparatory examples of arguments, or reprehensions of the sophisms, or fallacies of rhetoric, subjected to logic,—with their *pros* and *contras*.

whose writings he was always studying, but he was a writer of verse himself. Cicero at Rome had the assistance of Greek instructors, *more particularly the poet Archias*, who was living under the roof of L. Lucullus; while Cicero was thus preparing himself for the forum, he relieved the severity of his legal and philosophical studies *by an intermixture of poetry*. Even, as a boy, he composed a poem called "*Pontius Glaucus*" (which was extant in Plutarch's lively anecdotes,) he now translated the *Phenomena* of Aratus into Latin verse, besides writing two original poems, one called *Marius*, in honour of his fellow-townsmen, and another entitled *Timon*. He was also in the habit of declaiming in Greek and Latin. (See *Julius Cæsar*, Act I.) The debt Cicero owed to the writings of Archias, and indeed how much he valued poetry, is expressed in *Pro Archia, Poeta Oratio*. Bacon alludes to this in his *Advancement*.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR—The proposition that Shakespeare did not write the Plays going by that name, in one form or another, has been before the American public for forty-five years. Including books published in England and Germany, there are hundreds of books (not counting pamphlets—magazine articles) that have appeared during those forty-five years. Each one of these is stronger than the other, perhaps, and altogether the case against Shakespeare is probably accepted by everyone whose attention has been drawn to the matter at all by any one or more of these books.

Nevertheless, in the course of these forty-five years, every one of these hundreds of books has been reviewed, to greater or less length, in an American periodical: and, without a single exception, the reviewer has stated that the evidence was insufficient, the proposition preposterous, and the particular book under examination a mere *tour de force*, an error of judgment, etc., etc. In no one single instance, however, has the particular book reviewer stated in what points, in his opinion, evidence of Shakespeare's non-authorship was lacking; or what, in his opinion, would make that particular book, or the anti-Shakespearean case, satisfactory to himself! And yet our American book-reviewers and literary editors are, as a rule, a fairly able set of gentlemen; as able, perhaps, as anywhere, and as fairly disinterested, and with as little a squint towards the advertising column as any corresponding class anywhere is allowed to be by its superior editors.

The conclusion I have myself arrived at, therefore, is that books on anti-Shakespearean theories are ordered to be unfavourably reviewed in the United States. If not, such absolute unanimousness of book reviewers to one effect—with such absolute unanimousness of book readers to the opposite effect, would, it seems to me, be quite too much of a miracle.

I may add, that, in speaking of the "absolute unanimousness of book-readers," to a greater or less degree, on the anti-Shakespearean question, I believe myself to be accurate. I have never yet met a person who has read even one book on the subject, who has not readily admitted the existence of the doubt: or one who has carefully studied the matter who has not been convinced of the presumptive validity of the doubt! I am every day surprised by the usually careless, often reluctant, but rarely triumphant admission in casual conversation of people, when the subject is broached, that "Shakespeare has gone," and I believe that I am within the mark when I say that an off-hand allusion to Shakespeare almost anywhere will bring some jest or repartee indicating that the anti-Shakespearean question has been settled in each one's mind, as against at least some one of the Shakespearean pretensions once demanded as "orthodox."

Of course I am writing only of my own country (with which I am, I think, fairly conversant from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. I should be very glad to be corrected, however, if my statements are too sweeping, by any one of my own countrymen whose eye should fall on this. If he be not a book reviewer, or a literary editor, I shall take his statement as modifying my own in good faith.

Though I beg that this will not be understood as a reflection on that well-meaning and hard-working, and poorly-paid class of pen-lubbers, the American book-reviewer, or literary editor—all I mean is that the terms of their employment and obedience to orders does not admit of entire disinterestedness of opinion on anti-Shakespearean matters.

I am, sir, faithfully yours,

PAUL WEBSTER.

114, Grove-street, Jersey City, New Jersey.
March 29, 1901.

"TO BE ENQUIRED."

SHAKESPEARE'S COAT-OF-ARMS AND BACON'S EMBLEMS IDENTICAL.

PROMETHEUS, "the learned man," as Michael Rossetti points out, moulds men like Stone, forms and instructs them. The prudent man under the guidance of Wisdom (Minerva) steals fire from the sun, the symbol of Truth, and communicates it to the unlearned man, who, then endowed with life, becomes a rational and intelligent being. Shakespeare's Hawk and Spear represents this as clearly as Bacon's Owl and Torch or Candle. (See Gilbert Watt's edition of the "Advancement of Learning.")

The Hawk, Falcon, Eagle and Owl, Raptorial birds, are alike symbols of Divine Wisdom.

The Spear, in the same way, is the "brand," both blade and torch.

Seen in this light, are the Coat-of-Arms of William Shakespeare, the Dramatist, and the Emblems of Lord Saint Alban, the Philosopher, one and the same?

LINKS IN THE CHAIN.—A "BACON" WINDOW.

A WINDOW has lately been unveiled in All Saints' Church, Westbrook, Margate. It is dedicated to the soldiers who have fallen in South Africa. "Saint Alban" is written on a scroll above a *regal* figure in a red mantle, lined with ermine. This Saint wears a cavalier hat, flowing hair, and a pointed beard and curled moustache. Seven Tudor roses are prominent in the window full of Masonic symbols. *What Saint Alban is this?* Not the Saint and Martyr beheaded at Verulam in 285! Who then? The window is designed and executed by Messrs. *Bacon* of 11, Newman-street, Oxford-street.

A. A. L.

THOMAS RICE HENN, K.C., D.L., EX-RECORDER OF GALWAY.

THE death of Mr. Rice Henn came as a great shock to his numerous friends. Though he was in his eighty-eighth year, he had been so well and vigorous up to a few days before the end, that all who knew him reckoned on his being with them a good while yet. To see and speak with him, one would think he was still well on the sunny side of seventy. He was a man of great charm of manner, scholarly and refined appearance, and most interesting in conversation. He had had a distinguished career from boyhood. He was a King's Gold Medallist at Winchester, and Classical Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin. His career at the bar bore out the promise of his student days. After being for some years County Court Judge of Carlow, he was for thirty years Recorder of Galway and County Court Judge, in which position he won golden opinions for his unfailing courtesy, intelligence, and impartiality. He had remarkable artistic, antiquarian, and literary tastes and attainments. He was a great lover of Shakespeare, and a firm adherent of the Baconian theory. He delighted in having at his table Baconian friends, and certainly nothing could be more enjoyable than one of these literary symposia. One of the pleasantest evenings I ever spent was at one last December, when another legal luminary and distinguished scholar, Judge Webb, together with Sir Francis Cruise, M.D., D.L., both erudite Baconians of long standing, took leading parts in "the feast of reason and the flow of soul."

Sir Francis Cruise has been for many years what may be called the apostle of Baconianism in Ireland. He it was who made a convert of Judge Henn. He found him one day when sick reading Shakespeare. When the Doctor appeared, the learned Judge closed the book, saying that he found the immortal dramatist a great solace in the tediousness of illness. "But," said Sir Francis, "are you sure that the dramatist was really named Shakespeare? For my part, I am quite sure that the Stratford player never wrote a line of the plays or poems." Sir Francis describes with great humour how the Judge looked at him, as if he thought he was a lunatic, while at the same time evidently thinking of the probable consequences of being attended in his sickness by a man capable of such fantastic notions. However, after some conversation and a course of reading prescribed by his physician, the invalid became what he remained to the end, an enthusiastic supporter and propagator of the only rational solution of the Shakespearean mystery.

Judge Henn believed Mr. E. Reed's book, "*Bacon v. Shakspeare*," the best instrument available for making converts. He also had a high opinion of Mr. Strang's pamphlet, and of Dr. Bucke's article in *Pearson's* some years back. Quite lately he was very earnest about getting the first volume of Donnelly's "*Great Cryptogram*" published as a separate work. Had he lived he would have done all he could to effect this. Some two years ago he met an Anglican dignitary at a country house in Galway, who showed signs of pain and repugnance when spoken to about Bacon as the undoubted author of "*Shakespeare*," whereupon the subject was dropped. But the next day, when the Canon was leaving, he consented to take with him Reed's "*Bacon v. Shakspeare*." Soon after, in a letter which the Judge read for me, he cordially thanked him for the great service rendered, and added: "I am quite sure now that the player Shakspeare never wrote a line of the works commonly ascribed to him."

The Henn family is a distinguished one. Of English origin they have been settled in Co. Clare for over two hundred years, where their seat, Paradise Hill, is one of the most beautiful places in Ireland. They seem to have been always connected with the Bar. One was a judge in the middle of the eighteenth century. The nineteenth saw several of them holding high positions. The father and grandfather of the late judge were both Masters in Chancery. His sons too have distinguished themselves in their various careers. One of them, Thomas Rice Henn, fell in action during the Afghan war so heroically, that a notice of his life and achievements is given in the "*National Dictionary of Biography*." The judge told me an amusing story of this son, of whom he spoke with tears in his eyes. At a levee at Dublin Castle the Duke of Connaught, Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Ireland, hearing his name came to him and said:—"I am sure you are the father of my old friend, Rice Henn, with whom I was at Woolwich." "Yes, sir, I am," replied the judge. "Did he ever tell you anything about me?" asked his Royal Highness. "He told me, sir, that you used to poke fun at him about his name," was the reply. "Well," said the Duke, "when I went to Woolwich, I was put between the two best students in the place; they were both Irishmen, and one was named Henn and the other Peacocks, and I used to have some fun with them about their names."

The old judge was never tired of discussing the Bacon-Shakespeare problem from every point of view, and trying to get people to examine it thoroughly. He used to say that he was not sorry for being obliged to resign the Recordership of Galway, as he thereby got leisure to devote himself to this most interesting and important question. He would grow eloquent on the idolatrous superstition of traditional belief connected with the Stratford peasant. He was engaged writing a pamphlet on the subject addressed to the Irish bar. He told me a few weeks ago that down in the country he would work away at this and have it ready before returning to town. I had a letter from him a week before his death on the subject, which I replied to, and was expecting every day to hear from him, when on Monday, June 10th, the papers announced that he had died the previous Friday, after a few days illness. I was extremely sorry and shocked at the unexpected news, and felt quite sad and lonely at the thought of never again having a talk with him or a letter from him on a subject, in which we were both so deeply interested, and about which I had learnt so much from him. He used to ask illuminating questions

about difficulties, and had suggestive answers and solutions of the many puzzles of this the greatest of all literary and philosophical problems, so that it was a great treat to spend some time with him, so full of matter was he and so attractive in manner and character. We shall not see his like again. Everywhere there have been expressions of deep sorrow for his loss, and the greatest sympathy is felt with Mrs. Rice Henn and family.

WILLIAM A. SUTTON, S.I.

NOTICES.

It will be useful to the Society if Members or Associates would deliver, as popular lectures, some papers already written, and illustrated with 50 or 60 Lantern Slides. Both the papers and the illustrations will be lent on application, with proper introductions, to P., care of the Hon. Sec., Bacon Society (*pro tem.*), 3, Greencroft Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.

Another volume of deciphered work by Mrs. Wells Gallup, entitled, "The White Rose of Britaine," may be looked for this autumn.

We would also draw attention to a small book entitled "The Strange Case of Francis Tidir," by Mr. Parker Woodward. (Published by R. Banks and Son, Racquet Court, Fleet Street). It includes brief, but suggestive, inquiries into the truth of certain statements lately put forward regarding the marriage of Queen Elizabeth and the birth of Francis St. Alban; also an article on the name "Tidir," and other matters with which Baconian Students should acquaint themselves. It is truly Love's Labour Lost when, for lack of reading books already written, and facts recorded, inquirers painfully retread thorny paths, and go through researches which have been already undertaken. Francis would have termed this *Actum Agere*. Such notes as Mr. Woodward's should incite others to follow his example and so to forward the advance of learning.

In the press, to be published in the autumn, price 7/6 net. "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light." By R. M. THEOBALD, M.A. (Formerly Secretary to the Bacon Society, and Editor of the *Bacon Journal*). Author of "Shakespeare Dethroned." These Shakespeare Studies will show in great detail how clearly and completely the most characteristic features of Bacon's philosophic, moral and scientific thought, are reflected in the Shakespearean poetry, not merely by isolated or accidental parallelisms, but by such a comprehensive and pervading identity as admits of only one explanation. Subscribers' names may be sent to the author, R. M. THEOBALD, 32, Lee Terrace, Blackheath, S.E.

ERRATUM—In the April No., page 90, line 22, the word "bull" should read "quill."